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Chapter 2: U.S. Government Background

"The whole art of government consists in the art of being honest."
[Thomas Jefferson: Rights of British America, 1774. ME 1:209, Papers 1:134]

"The 'Truth' about income taxes is so precious to the U.S. government that it must be surrounded by a bodyguard of lies."
[Family Guardian Fellowship]

"Government is not reason; it is not eloquence; it is force! Like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master."
[George Washington]

"Government big enough to supply everything you need is big enough to take away everything you have."
[Thomas Jefferson]

"Since government, even in its best state is an evil, the object principally to be aimed at is that we should have as little of it as the general peace of human society will permit."
[William Godwin (1756-1836) English novelist, biographer, philosopher]

"National injustice is the surest road to national downfall."
[William E. Gladstone (1809-1898) English statesman]

"The course of history shows as a government grows, liberty decreases."
[Thomas Jefferson]

"You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.
You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot lift the wage earner by tearing down the wage payer.
You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do themselves."
[Abraham Lincoln]

"I believe that if the people of this nation fully understood what Congress has done to them...they would move on Washington; they would not wait for an election. It adds up to a preconceived plan to destroy the economic and social independence of the United States."
[George W. Malone, U.S. Senator from Nevada, 1957]

"A nation can survive its fools and even the ambitious. But it cannot survive treason from within. An enemy at the gates is less formidable, for he is known and he carries his banners openly against the city. But the traitor moves among those within the gates freely, his sly whispers rustling through all alleys, heard in the very halls of government itself. For the traitor appears no traitor; he speaks in the accents familiar to his victim, and he wears their face and their garments and he appeals to the baseness that lies deep in the hearts of all men. He rots the soil of a nation; he works secretly and unknown in the night to undermine the pillars of a city; he infects the body politic so that it can no longer resist. A murderer is less to be feared. The traitor is the plague."
[Cicero]

"In the early years, government was like a sapling oak tree, raising it's limbs and shading and protecting those below. And that mighty oak is now aged, with deep roots straining for more, and sagging limbs, threatening to fall and crush those under it. For over two hundred years, we have sent people to Washington TO MAKE LAWS. So we should not now be surprised at the unfortunate result, that they did do what we sent them there to do, and the laws, regulations, statutes and codes are suffocating the life out of the American Citizens. It is high time people ran for office with the pledge of

REPEAL !! REPEAL!!"
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The impetus for reform and change must come from without, and must originate from the sovereign people who created the government in the first place: YOU!

According to Edward Gibbon, the author of "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire", there were 5 major contributing factors to the decline of every civilization:

1. Debasement of money.
2. Debasement of religion.
3. Confiscatory levels of taxation.
4. Decline of morals.
5. Rampant crime and corruption.

How many of these factors do YOU see in operation in the U.S. today? The average lifespan of nation-states is 200 years. The U.S. is 228 years old. We'll cover many of the factors that are leading to our decline in this chapter. If you would like to read an online version of Mr. Gibbon’s book, you can do so at:

http://www.ccel.org/g/gibbon/decline/home.html

2.1 Code of Ethics for Government Service

"Sifting through the blather, the political paradigm has devolved into saying what you must to get elected, passing legislation that may or may not be good for the country, and staying in office. Analyzing this sorry spectacle every four years, it appears that too many Americans are willing to put their faith in a power-seeking, mandarin class of second- and third-rate professional careerist politicians whose primary allegiance, I'm afraid, is to themselves. What is needed are persons of impeccable, statesman-like character and reasoned judgment -- people, for the most part, who would be instinctively repelled by the political process."

[Barrett Kalellis]

This section concerns itself with the moral and ethical requirements which must be met by employees of our federal government. Later on in section 4.1, you will learn that all of the ethics laws and rules we list in this section collectively describe the characteristics of what is called a “fiduciary relationship”, and that public servants are “trustees” of what is called the “public trust”. The “beneficiaries” of the “public trust” are the constituents of the “public servant”. A fiduciary is someone bound by contract to act primarily for another’s benefit. In the case of “public servants”, the contract that binds them is the U.S. Constitution, and the person they are acting on behalf of is their constituents. Any violation of trust or injury caused by public servants against the rights of the beneficiaries of the trust (constituents) is called a “breach of fiduciary duty” and is treated by the courts as a tort or injury for which public servants can be held liable in court. This will become important in chapter 3 of the Tax Fraud Prevention Manual, Form #06.008, where we talk about remedies for those who have been wronged and injured by the illegal acts of IRS agents, judges, and attorneys working for the Department of Justice.

Below is the Code of Ethics for Government Service, Public Law 96-303. This is the moral and ethical standard by which the performance of all government employees is measured. We ask you to consider this carefully as you read through the following chapters and learn what the “public servants” in the U.S. Congress and the IRS have been doing to your constitutional rights and the fraudulent and illegal taking of your property with federal income taxes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code of Ethics for Government Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Law 96-303.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passed June 27, 1980 unanimously by Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed into law July 3, 1980 by President.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Put loyalty to the highest moral principles and to country above loyalty to persons, party, or Government department.

II. Uphold the Constitution, laws, and regulations of the United States and of all governments therein and never be a party to their evasion.

III. Give a full day's labor for a full day's pay; giving earnest effort and best thought to the performance of duties.
IV. Seek to find and employ more efficient and economical ways of getting tasks done.

V. Never discriminate unfairly by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not; and never accept, for himself or herself or for family members, favors or benefits under circumstances which might be construed by reasonable persons as influencing the performance of governmental duties.

VI. Make no private promises of any kind binding upon the duties of office, since a Government employee has no private word which can be binding on public duty.

VII. Engage in no business with the Government, either directly or indirectly, which is inconsistent with the conscientious performance of governmental duties.

VIII. Never use any information gained confidentially in the performance of governmental duties as a means of making private profit.

IX. Expose corruption whenever discovered.

X. Uphold these principles, ever conscious that public office is a public trust.

In addition, Presidential Executive Order 12731, issued by George Bush on October 17, 1990, entitled “Principles of Ethical Conduct for Government Officers and Employees”, identifies ethics rules applicable to government employees. You can read this order for yourself at:


Here is an excerpt of Executive Order 12731 for your benefit:

"Part 1 -- PRINCIPLES OF ETHICAL CONDUCT

"Section 101. Principles of Ethical Conduct. To ensure that every citizen can have complete confidence in the integrity of the Federal Government, each Federal employee shall respect and adhere to the fundamental principles of ethical service as implemented in regulations promulgated under sections 201 and 301 of this order:

"(a) Public service is a public trust, requiring employees to place loyalty to the Constitution, the laws, and ethical principles above private gain.

"(b) Employees shall not hold financial interests that conflict with the conscientious performance of duty.

"(c) Employees shall not engage in financial transactions using nonpublic Government information or allow the improper use of such information to further any private interest.

"(d) An employee shall not, except pursuant to such reasonable exceptions as are provided by regulation, solicit or accept any gift or other item of monetary value from any person or entity seeking official action from, doing business with, or conducting activities regulated by the employee's agency, or whose interests may be substantially affected by the performance or nonperformance of the employee's duties.

"(e) Employees shall put forth honest effort in the performance of their duties.

"(f) Employees shall make no unauthorized commitments or promises of any kind purporting to bind the Government.

"(g) Employees shall not use public office for private gain.

"(h) Employees shall act impartially and not give preferential treatment to any private organization or individual.

"(i) Employees shall protect and conserve Federal property and shall not use it for other than authorized activities.
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"(j) Employees shall not engage in outside employment or activities, including seeking or negotiating for employment, that conflict with official Government duties and responsibilities.

"(k) Employees shall disclose waste, fraud, abuse, and corruption to appropriate authorities.

"(l) Employees shall satisfy in good faith their obligations as citizens, including all just financial obligations, especially those--such as Federal, State, or local taxes--that are imposed by law.

"(m) Employees shall adhere to all laws and regulations that provide equal opportunity for all Americans regardless of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or handicap.

"(n) Employees shall endeavor to avoid any actions creating the appearance that they are violating the law or the ethical standards promulgated pursuant to this order.

Sec. 102. Limitations on Outside Earned Income.

"(a) No employee who is appointed by the President to a full-time noncareer position in the executive branch (including full-time noncareer employees in the White House Office, the Office of Policy Development, and the Office of Cabinet Affairs), shall receive any earned income for any outside employment or activity performed during that Presidential appointment.

"(b) The prohibition set forth in subsection (a) shall not apply to any full-time noncareer employees employed pursuant to 3 U.S.C. 105 and 3 U.S.C. 107(a) at salaries below the minimum rate of basic pay then paid for GS-9 of the General Schedule. Any outside employment must comply with relevant agency standards of conduct, including any requirements for approval of outside employment.

Another source of ethical standards for U.S. Government Service can be found in 5 C.F.R., Chapter XVI, Subchapter B, Part 2635. Here is an excerpt from the first section in that part:

TITLE 5-ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL
CHAPTER XVI-OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ETHICS
PART 2635-STANDARDS OF ETHICAL CONDUCT FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH--Table of Contents
Subpart A--General Provisions
Sec. 2635.101 Basic obligation of public service.

(a) Public service is a public trust. Each employee has a responsibility to the United States Government and its citizens to place loyalty to the Constitution, laws and ethical principles above private gain. To ensure that every citizen can have complete confidence in the integrity of the Federal Government, each employee shall respect and adhere to the principles of ethical conduct set forth in this section, as well as the implementing standards contained in this part and in supplemental agency regulations.

(b) General principles. The following general principles apply to every employee and may form the basis for the standards contained in this part. Where a situation is not covered by the standards set forth in this part, employees shall apply the principles set forth in this section in determining whether their conduct is proper.

(1) Public service is a public trust, requiring employees to place loyalty to the Constitution, the laws and ethical principles above private gain.

(2) Employees shall not hold financial interests that conflict with the conscientious performance of duty.

(3) Employees shall not engage in financial transactions using nonpublic Government information or allow the improper use of such information to further any private interest.

(4) An employee shall not, except as permitted by subpart B of this part, solicit or accept any gift or other item of monetary value from any person or entity seeking official action from, doing business with, or conducting activities regulated by the employee’s agency, or whose interests may be substantially affected by the performance or nonperformance of the employee’s duties.

(5) Employees shall put forth honest effort in the performance of their duties.

(6) Employees shall not knowingly make unauthorized commitments or promises of any kind purporting to bind the Government.

(7) Employees shall not use public office for private gain.
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(8) Employees shall act impartially and not give preferential treatment to any private organization or individual.

(9) Employees shall protect and conserve Federal property and shall not use it for other than authorized activities.

(10) Employees shall not engage in outside employment or activities, including seeking or negotiating for employment, that conflict with official Government duties and responsibilities.

(11) Employees shall disclose waste, fraud, abuse, and corruption to appropriate authorities.

(12) Employees shall satisfy in good faith their obligations as citizens, including all just financial obligations, especially those--such as Federal, State, or local taxes--that are imposed by law.

(13) Employees shall adhere to all laws and regulations that provide equal opportunity for all Americans regardless of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, or handicap.

(14) Employees shall endeavor to avoid any actions creating the appearance that they are violating the law or the ethical standards set forth in this part. Whether particular circumstances create an appearance that the law or these standards have been violated shall be determined from the perspective of a reasonable person with knowledge of the relevant facts.

(c) Related statutes. In addition to the standards of ethical conduct set forth in this part, there are conflict of interest statutes that prohibit certain conduct. Criminal conflict of interest statutes of general applicability to all employees, 18 U.S.C. 201, 203, 205, 208, and 209, are summarized in the appropriate subparts of this part and must be taken into consideration in determining whether conduct is proper. Citations to other generally applicable statutes relating to employee conduct are set forth in subpart I and employees are further cautioned that there may be additional statutory and regulatory restrictions applicable to them generally or as employees of their specific agencies. Because an employee is considered to be on notice of the requirements of any statute, an employee should not rely upon any description or synopsis of a statutory restriction, but should refer to the statute itself and obtain the advice of an agency ethics official as needed.

Based on the above ethics requirements for government employees, we can safely reach the following conclusions about the proper conduct of government officials and employees:

1. Government employees have a duty to write laws that are as brief and simple as possible so that all Citizens with very minimal education can read and understand them without the aid of a “priest” from the “priesthood of lawyers” known as the American Bar Association. This will ensure a civil society with a minimum of police, litigation, lawyers, conflict, courts, and laws. It will also prevent Citizens from becoming financial slaves to the legal profession in understanding and defending their legal rights.

2. Government agencies and employees should be familiar with the laws that regulate and define their duties, and should be able to clearly explain to Citizens when asked, the legal basis for their delegated authority and the bounds of that authority. They should also be able to provide to the Citizen upon demand the laws that regulate their authority. This requirement also reinforces the need for the laws to be simple so that the average government employee can read and understand them himself.

3. If a Citizen asks a government employee what authority he has to make a certain decision and from where that authority derives, and the government employee or officer can’t explain or provide legal evidence of that authority, then the Citizen can safely assume the employee or officer has NO authority to make the decision or impose the obligation on the Citizen.

4. Government employees should encourage Citizens to question their authority at all times, so that they can be held accountable to the public for the job they do and will consistently behave within their lawfully delegated authority.

5. If a fraud or even a deliberate deception has been committed by the government and against Citizens, and especially if this fraud or deception occurs because of laws that are too complex or designed to mislead, the only ethical or proper action for government employees and Citizens to take is to expose it and see that it is corrected promptly and in the meantime, to NOT enforce the law until it is clarified and simplified (this is called the “void for vagueness doctrine” by the Supreme Court). This is the only way to restore and maintain trust of Citizens in their government. Correcting such mistakes or deception includes:

5.1. Updating all government publications to consistently portray and clarify the complete truth about tax matters that the public is clearly confused over. One way to identify where confusion lies is to look at whether court rulings are consistent in a particular area or are erratic and unpredictable or do not agree from one circuit court to the next. The goal should be to minimize the need for expensive litigation and minimize risks individuals must take to obey what they think or believe is the law.

5.2. Simplifying laws to make them easier to understand.
5.3. Using non-lawyers to review the laws as written and help simplify them before they are enacted.

5.4. The courts holding employees in the government and agencies collectively liable and accountable for whatever they say on ANY publication or form that are provided to the public. For instance, if a member of the public relies on the IRS publications to reach a conclusion, and the IRS misleads the public about their tax liability in those publications, then the IRS and the supervisor in the IRS who approved the publication should be either held personally liable or should be FIRED for the constructive fraud that caused the breach of public trust and injury to the Citizen.

6. If a Citizen, through deception by the government, falls into error and states a fact or makes an assertion about himself that is not strictly true from a legal perspective, it is the duty and the obligation of the government employee, if he is aware of this mistake, to bring it to the attention of his supervisor and the Citizen in order to prevent needless injury to the Citizen. This reinforces the idea that there is a fiduciary relationship and public trust that exists between Citizens and their government.

7. Government supervisors who penalize, harass, demote, or fire employees who enforce or conform to any government ethics requirement should be promptly disciplined by an independent investigative agency outside of their chain of command, not unlike the way sexual harassment charges are handled.

2.2 The Limited Powers and Sovereignty of the U.S. Government

"The ultimate authority...resides in the people alone..."

[James Madison, Federalist Paper No. 46]

The Christian founding fathers wanted a federal government of very limited and precisely defined powers. Why? It was based on their Christian beliefs! The quote below directly from the mouth of Jesus (God) Himself in the Bible affirms and reveals God’s will with regard to human government:

"You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and those who are great exercise authority over them. Yet it shall not be so among you; but whoever desires to become great among you, let him be your servant, and whoever desires to be first among you, let him be your slave—just as the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many."

[Matthew 20:25-28, Bible, NKJV]

It is the above quote from the Bible, we believe, that formed the basis for the prudent desire of the founding fathers to build so many checks and balances into the Constitution to protect us from the government. They wanted to make sure that the government would always continue to be our servant. They wanted to ensure that the power of the government would be constrained and restrained very carefully in order to keep government and the people serving in government in their proper role as servants of the Sovereign People rather than masters or dictators over them. Thomas Jefferson, a Christian man and author of the Declaration of Independence, defined precisely the intent of the founding fathers in this regard as follows:

"It would be a dangerous delusion were a confidence in the men of our choice to silence our fears for the safety of our rights...Confidence is everywhere the parent of despotism. Free government is founded in jealousy, and not in confidence. It is jealousy and not confidence which prescribes limited constitutions, to bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power...Our Constitution has accordingly fixed the limits to which, and no further, our confidence may go...In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

[Thomas Jefferson: Draft Kentucky Resolutions, 1798. ME 17:388]

Jefferson also defined what he believed were the very limited and defined powers of the federal government as a whole in a letter to Major John Cartwright in June 5, 1824:

"With respect to our State and federal governments, I do not think their relations are correctly understood by foreigners. They generally suppose the former subordinate to the latter. But this is not the case. They are co-ordinate departments of one simple and integral whole. To the State governments are reserved all legislative and administration, in affairs which concern their own citizens only, and to the federal government is given whatever concerns foreigners, or the citizens of the other States; these functions alone being made federal. The one is domestic, the other the foreign branch of the same government; neither having control over the other, but within its own department."

[Thomas Jefferson, "Writing of Thomas Jefferson" pub by Taylor & Maury, Washington DC, 1854, quote number VII 355-61, from correspondence to Major John Cartwright, June 5, 1824.]

The below cites from several court rulings help to further define and circumscribe the limits of the powers of the federal government:

The Great IRS Hoax: Why We Don’t Owe Income Tax, version 4.54
TOP SECRET: For Official Treasury/IRS Use Only (FOOU) Copyright Family Guardian Fellowship http://famguardian.org/
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The United States Government that we the Sovereign People created and entrusted to protect our fundamental rights, has falsely misled us into believing that the Government is Sovereign and we the People are “persons” subject to its [the United States] territorial or subject matter jurisdiction who are also called “subjects”. What is their motivation for this mass deception? It is a maxim of law that the Rights of Sovereigns cannot be taxed or regulated by the Government. Only government granted privileges can be taxed and regulated by the government. In law, a “human” person is called a “natural person.” The “person,” referred to in Codes, unless a counter intent is evident, is a corporate or juristic entity with only legislative rights. By creating a “legal term” for a person that excluded the Sovereign, the Government has been able to create vast volumes of government rules and regulations for the “person” to pay income tax, property tax, license and registration fees, business license fees, marriage license fees, dog license fees, etc. It is also this juristic (recognized at law) “person” that the government can jail as an incentive to comply with its “Codes.” The Sovereign is NOT the legislative “person”.

If you doubt the above assertion, take a look at 4 U.S.C. §110(a), which defines the term “person”. It points to 26 U.S.C. §3797 for the definition, which was mysteriously repealed. Could it be that Congress DOESN’T want you to know that the word “person” doesn’t include you, so they won’t define it for you?

The Term Person does not include the Sovereign!

“Since in common usage, the term person does not include the sovereign, statutes not employing the phrase are ordinarily construed to exclude it.”

[United States v. Cooper Corporation, 312 U.S. 600 (1941)]

By way of clarification, the above cite refers to a state and not a natural person, but we use it here to clarify the concept of personal sovereignty which we are trying to explain.

2.3 Thomas Jefferson on Property Rights and the Foundations of Our Government

Thomas Jefferson was the wise and brilliant man who wrote the Declaration of Independence of the United States. Before we launch into what our government is doing to violate our property rights with its illegal taxation policies, let’s look at what he had to say about property rights:

“The whole art of government consists in the art of being honest.”

[Thomas Jefferson: Rights of British America, 1774. ME 1:209, Papers 1:134 ]

“With all [our] blessings, what more is necessary to make us a happy and a prosperous people? Still one thing more, fellow citizens—a wise and frugal Government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government, and this is necessary to close the circle of our felicities.”

[Thomas Jefferson: 1st Inaugural, 1801. ME 3:320 ]
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"Our wish... is, that the public efforts may be directed honestly to the public good, that peace be cultivated, civil and religious liberty unassailed, law and order preserved, equality of rights maintained, and that state of property, equal or unequal, which results to every man from his own industry, or that of his fathers."

[Thomas Jefferson: 2nd Inaugural, 1805. ME 3:382 ]

"The true foundation of republican government is the equal right of every citizen in his person and property and in their management."

[Thomas Jefferson to Samuel Kercheval, 1816. ME 15:36 ]

The right to procure property and to use it for one's own enjoyment is essential to the freedom of every person, and our other rights would mean little without these rights of property ownership. It is also for these reasons that the government's power to tax property is placed in those representatives most frequently and directly responsible to the people, since it is the people themselves who must pay those taxes out of their holdings of property.

"Persons and property make the sum of the objects of government."

[Thomas Jefferson to James Madison, 1789. ME 7:459 ]

"Nothing is ours, which another may deprive us of."

[Thomas Jefferson to Maria Cosway, 1786. ME 5:440 ]

By nature's law, every man has a right to seize and retake by force his own property taken from him by another by force or fraud. Nor is this natural right among the first which is taken into the hands of regular government after it is instituted. It was long retained by our ancestors. It was a part of their common law, laid down in their books, recognized by all the authorities, and regulated as to circumstances of practice."

[Thomas Jefferson: Batture at New Orleans, 1812. ME 18:104 ]

"To take from one because it is thought that his own industry and that of his father's has acquired too much, in order to spare to others, who, or whose fathers have not exercised equal industry and skill, is to violate arbitrarily the first principle of association—the guarantee to every one of a free exercise of his industry and the fruits acquired by it."

[Thomas Jefferson: Note in Destutt de Tracy's "Political Economy," 1816. ME 14:466 ]

"[The] rights [of the people] to the exercise and fruits of their own industry can never be protected against the selfishness of rulers not subject to their control at short periods."

[Thomas Jefferson to Isaac H. Tiffany, 1816.]

"Our wish... is that... equality of rights [be] maintained, and that state of property, equal or unequal, which results to every man from his own industry or that of his fathers."

[Thomas Jefferson: 2nd Inaugural Address, 1805. ME 3:382 ]

"If the overgrown wealth of an individual is deemed dangerous to the State, the best corrective is the law of equal inheritance to all in equal degree; and the better, as this enforces a law of nature, while extra-taxation violates it."

[Thomas Jefferson: Note in Destutt de Tracy's "Political Economy," 1816. ME 14:466 ]

2.4 The Freedom Test

"I may die a beggar, but with the Grace of God, I will not die a slave."

"There is a growing sense of outrage in this country. The working people are being crushed. Let the congressmen who won office by promises of benefits and programs, pay them out of their pocket. Such promises should not, CANNOT, AND WILL NOT be yokes of slavery, borne upon the backs of the men and women who labor each day to put bread on their table!"

2.4.1 Are You Free or Do You Just Think You Are?

(If you have any doubts just answer the following 12 questions and you will know for sure.)

1. Is more than 15% of your hard earned income forcibly being taken away from you through taxation by your government? (yes or no)
2. Does your government force you to participate in Social Security and Medicare? (yes or no)
3. Is your Social Security number being used by your government to monitor your income, bank accounts and other activities? (yes or no)
4. Is your government engaging in e-mail surveillance operations without probable cause or search warrants? (yes or no)
5. When re-entering your own country after a vacation can your government search you and your belongings without probable cause or a search warrant? (yes or no)

6. Does your government require you to apply, gain its permission, and pay additional taxes for permits in order to simply add on a room or remodel your own home, on your own property? (yes or no)

7. Does your government tax your very ability to talk and communicate with family and friends? (yes or no)

8. Does your government practice discrimination against or preference for any individual or group of individuals based upon their race, creed, gender, or social class? (yes or no)

9. If a nationwide television network interviewed you on a variety of political topics would you hide some of your true beliefs for fear of the consequences of publicly crossing the boundaries of 'political correctness'? (yes or no)

10. Has your government accumulated an overbearing National Debt liability for you, your children and grandchildren to pay off? (yes or no)

11. Is your government dominated by politicians more beholden to their egos and corporate patrons than to you and your individual rights? (yes or no)

12. Do you still think you are free? (yes or no)

2.4.2 Key to Answers

1. **YES.** In the United States today the average individual pays nearly 50% of his or her income in taxes of one form or another. When 50% of your work day (4 of every 8 hours) is forcibly being taken from you by your government, is that not state sponsored slavery?

   The successful examples of the United States (1800-1929) and modern day Hong Kong have proven that the legitimate operations of government can be funded by a total individual tax of 15% or less of income. Why, and from what authority, are we being forced to pay more?

   Please note that the federal income tax in the United States is only half of the tax picture, for one must also consider the following: state income taxes, state disability taxes, social security taxes, Medicare taxes, Medicaid taxes, unemployment insurance taxes, local taxes, property taxes, capital gains taxes, estate and inheritance taxes, gift taxes, sales taxes, electricity taxes, water taxes, sewage taxes, telephone taxes, cable taxes, corporate taxes, import taxes, export taxes, luxury taxes, gasoline taxes, alcohol taxes, tobacco taxes, vehicle registration taxes, hotel accommodation taxes, airplane ticket taxes, rental car taxes, building permit taxes, regulation taxes, licensing taxes, parking taxes, etc. (Note that the average individual in Europe pays far more than 50%.)

2. **YES.** When Social Security was first enacted in 1935 it was funded by a 2% payroll tax, today it is funded by a 12.4% payroll tax. The Social Security tax has been raised 54 times in a mere 65 years, measuring a staggering 520% increase. It is now the largest single tax for seven out of 10 taxing households. In 1935 only the first $3,000 of taxpayer income was subject to Social Security taxes, by 1971 it was the first $7,800, and today it is the first $72,600. Medicare/Medicaid, started in 1965, was initially funded by a 2.9% payroll tax, with only the first $4,800 of taxpayer income subject to it. Today the rate is the same, however the income cap has been removed. Even with these dramatic expansions of taxation, both programs are still on the verge of bankruptcy. (This means more tax increases to come in the next economic downturn.) Because you are forced to participate, Social Security and Medicare are without a doubt the largest PONZI SCHEMES ever conceived of. Yet no politician will dare say so. Who is going to pay the Social Security and Medicare benefits for the 78 million baby boomers set to begin retiring in 2010?

3. **YES.** Try to get a job, open a bank or brokerage account, or buy a home without one.

4. **YES.** Take a hard look at the new FBI system known as Carnivore. Once it is connected to an ISP network it has the potential to monitor all communications on that network. Earthlink Inc. has already refused to install this FBI system, saying it had no way of knowing whether it was in fact limiting its surveillance operations to the criminal investigation at hand, or trolling more broadly. (What happened to the protections guaranteed us by the 4th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution?)

5. **YES.** If you doubt this, try crossing from Mexico to the U.S. in an older model van with tinted windows. (What happened to the protections guaranteed us by the 4th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution?)

6. **YES.** The state, city and local governments of the United States have completely undermined the sacred principle of 'property rights' by forcing us to seek government permission to carry out routine additions and changes to our private property, by forcing us to pay building permit taxes for the right to do so, and by forcing us to pay property taxes or face its confiscation.

7. **YES.** Take a close look at the taxes you are forced to pay for both your wired and wireless phone services. Also note the United Nations report of July 1999 which specifically endorses a tax of one American cent to be levied on all lengthy e-mails. E-mail taxes are next if we let down our guard.
8. **YES.** Government first rationalized the existence of slavery, then it rationalized the existence of segregation, and now it rationalizes the existence of affirmative action and quotas. ALL are discrimination, and ALL are wrong.

9. **YES,** for most of us. Is it really 'Freedom of Speech' when you are afraid to speak your mind?

10. **YES.** As of September 1, 2000 the U.S. National Debt was over $5.64 TRILLION and growing by an average of $45 million per day. With the U.S. population estimated to be 276,299,415, that means each Citizen's share of this debt is over $20,425. Ignore the rhetoric of the politicians when they claim to be paying down this debt with the budget surpluses, because they are NOT. In fact this Congress, the Republican majority 106th, has become the largest domestic spending Congress since the late 1970's.

11. **YES.** Take a hard look at the politicians and their voting records if you doubt this.

12. **NO,** we are not free, we only think we are. The time has come for us to face this difficult truth and start doing something about it.

### 2.4.3 Do You Still Think You are Free?

ARE YOU TRULY FREE... when over half of your hard earned “money” is stolen, directly and indirectly, by “legalized fraud” called “income taxes” to support unconscionable spending habits of career politicians... and rulers around the world? And,

ARE YOU TRULY FREE... when government agents falsely accuse people of “crimes” shoot and kill a nursing mother and child (Weaver), use banned gas to burn out over 80 people (Waco Holocaust), Gordon Call, etc. And,

ARE YOU TRULY FREE... when you are deprived of your currency which you worked hard for, paid taxes on? The $1,000 and $500 bills were slyly taken out of circulation. When anyone DOES NOT want to play the game of “cashless, checkless society” he is accused of “breaking the law”. Plastic strips are now inserted in the new currency. Bankers/government claim anyone with a large amount of cash is a criminal. This violates many religious beliefs such as Rev.,13:16-18. The conspirators’ real purpose is to work for the private bankers, putting us in a cashless, checkless society. And,

WHEN... in our “LAND OF THE FREE” you can no longer drive on freeways or public street without buying a driver’s license and car registration from bureaucrats... giving them LEGAL TITLE of OWNERSHIP to your car in exchange for a “certificate of title” that shows you gave your “true ownership” AWAY? And,

WHEN... BUREAUCRATS MAKE YOU PAY legal ransom to a private insurance-company so you can drive your car? And,

WHEN... in our “LAND OF THE FREE” you must send your children to a licensed school or bureaucrats can/will legally kidnap your children, confiscate your property and put you in jail? And,

When... you must read non-mainstream publications in order to learn THE TRUTH, because the national news media tells only what the “political establishment” allows it’s public to see or hear as “news”...? And,

WHEN... OUR “LAND OF THE FREE” has more political-prisoners than other nations; more slave-labor-camp-prisons (UNICOR) are being built every year? And,

WHEN... bureaucrats claim a crime needs ‘no victim” by claiming a crime is an offense against an abstract (legal fiction) called the state? And,

WHEN... business-income taxes are piled on top of each other... hidden in the prices of every American product, GROSSLY INFLATING costs, forcing industries to leave our country... taking millions of our best jobs with them? And,

WHEN... in our “LAND OF THE FREE” bureaucrats can know most of your financial transactions and “legally pry” into your bank records without your knowledge or consent? (violating a sacred trust, your privacy, and 4th amendment right).

And,

WHEN... you believe the BIG-LIE that your RIGHTS come from “public servants” instead of from ALMIGHTY GOD, Creator of all nature? And,

WHEN you “pay” your debts with dollar bills which are notices of debt you owe to the PRIVATELY OWNED Federal Reserve Banks (a private corporation) which pay no income taxes... and who create money out of thin air? And,
WHEN...in our “LAND OF THE FREE” “public servants” have created a spider web of over TWO MILLION laws and rules entangling every part of your life with entrapment schemes, (Road Blocks)-etc., while “COURTS:Supreme Court” judges seldom agree on the meaning of any of them? And,

WHEN...if you don't pay your taxes (rent) the real owner of your property shows up, takes it from you, violating Allodial Land Rights ... and may/will shoot you, or put you in jail. And,

WHEN...in our “LAND OF THE FREE” it’s okay to legally murder unborn babies, cleverly calling aborticide “abortion” And,

WHEN... “public-servant judges” illegally guide votes of Citizen Jurors by LYING, telling them they must vote to enforce the “alleged laws” of the case (even if it violates Rights secured by the constitution)? And,

WHEN...the word “person” is “legally defined” as a “corporation” and judges and government lawyers Coerce Juries into jailing fellow Americans for disobeying laws made for private bankers and private corporations to CONTROL our once FREE PEOPLE? And,

WHEN...your church must get a 501-C3 license (tax exempt) so its members can “write off gifts”-legally worship the “state god”, not ALMIGHTY GOD, Creator of all nature? And,

WHEN...career-politicians, tax collectors, police and courts (judges) are more of a threat to life, liberty and property than a thief in the night? (Been in court lately?) And,

WHEN you SADLY LEARN.. More crimes occur in American court rooms in one day than in the streets in a whole year?

WHEN...in our “LAND OF THE FREE” your children are a ward of the state because you used a marriage license? (Your children are not your children because of that license!) And,

WHEN...you are jailed for exercising your God-given Constitutionally secured Rights if you don’t “grease the palms” (fines=mulct) of bureaucrats? And,

WHEN...in our “LAND OF THE FREE” YOU CAN NO LONGER PRACTICE Free Enterprise or work without the SS-ID number, “Mark of the Beast”, and you are forced to buy a permit or license from bureaucrats or go to jail? And,

WHEN everything you and your children will ever “own” is mortgaged to foreign bankers who own the private Federal Reserve Banks, your loan could be due and collectible on demand...BECAUSE THE CONGRESS REFUSES to OBEY the CONSTITUTION providing our country with a debt-free, Honest money system! And,

WHEN...you could be dying from a disease (cancer) that is curable in other countries (suppressed in AmeriKa since the early 30’s) with certain medicines, nutrients, and vitamins which, if used to save your life, is a crime in our “LAND OF THE FREE” stripping us of our 1st and 9th amendment Rights, FREEDOM of CHOICE? And,

WHEN... if you say something publicly that is not “Politically Correct”, the news-media can publicly condemn you without a trial, by implying you are a racist, cultist, neo-Nazi, anti-Semitic, hate monger, bigot, radical, armed and dangerous, extreme-right-winger, tax-protester, un-American...etc.? And,

WHEN...the Federal Government pretends to wage a “War On Drugs” (actually promoting drugs) as an excuse to make laws that deprive us of our God-given RIGHTS to Life, Liberty, and Property ...Freedom to Choose and to be Left Alone? And,

WHEN...CRIME PAYS BIG... for Big Brother Government, lying politicians, judges, government lawyers, police...because every new law causes many more victimless crimes as an excuse for higher and higher taxes, supposedly used to punish the violators (victims) of newly invented crimes, which God never thought of, against a legal fiction, the State? And,

WHEN...in our “LAND OF THE FREE” the flag displayed in court rooms and other public buildings has a gold fringe border, which is NOT the American flag, indicating that we are under Martial Law unannounced? And,
WHEN..... you must ask and pay bureaucrats for legal permission to get married, even though marriage is a sacrament directly from our loving father, ALMIGHTY GOD? And,

WHEN...Republican and Democratic Presidents give your taxes to foreign countries, food that should be given to our needy is given to foreign nations, destroying our own people...our self-defense arms are confiscated...creating wars and riots; the United States Military is under the United Nations command...YOUR JOB exported overseas...our “LAND OF THE FREE” PLACED UNDER THE DICTATORIAL RULE of NON-ELECTED FOREIGNERS called the NEW WORLD ORDER?! Creating wars and riots;

IF THIS IS FREEDOM
Then WHAT is SLAVERY???

If You Think You're FREE,
What can you do without:
A. getting a permit?
B. getting a license?
C. paying a tax?
D. your Social Surveillance-ID # (should not be used for identification)?

2.5 14 Signposts to Slavery

In 1972 a wonderful little book was published. It arrived with little fanfare yet somehow it has managed to survive all these years. Most people have never read it. These are the same people who today are asking questions about what went wrong with America. These are the same people who today find that their plans for the future, no matter how hard they have worked to make those plans a reality, have vanished into thin air. These are the same people who are working 3 jobs to keep what one job secured for them 20 years ago......These people are you and I, the working middle class, the "We the People."

The book is titled "None Dare Call It Conspiracy," and was authored by Gary Allen with Larry Abraham. It was considered very controversial back when it was published. In retrospect it appears to have been a blueprint for the future of America. That America is perhaps where we are all living today.

If you doubt the possibility of a conspiracy to bring America to its knees and perhaps install a totalitarian dictatorship through the conversion of our republic into a democracy you need only look to the changes in our laws. Gary Allen provided his readers with fourteen signposts on the road to totalitarianism. They were compiled by Dr. Warren Carroll, a refugee from Yugoslavian communism. The list is in no particular order. However, nothing on the list existed in American law at the time the list was compiled. Read it now, experience it for yourself. Any one of the listed items would be a clear warning that the totalitarian state is very near, and a significant number of perhaps five or more could possibly suggest that the freedom we have once enjoyed and the preservation of our Great Republic has been lost.

FOURTEEN SIGNPOSTS TO SLAVERY

1. Restrictions on taking money out of the country and on the establishment or retention of a foreign bank account by an American citizen.
2. Abolition of private ownership of hand guns.
3. Detention of individuals without judicial process.
4. Requirements that private financial transactions be keyed to social security numbers or other government identification so that government records of these transactions can be fed into a computer.
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5. Use of compulsory education laws to forbid attendance at presently existing private school.

6. Compulsory non-military service.


8. An official declaration that anti-communist organizations are subversive and subsequent legal action taken to suppress them.

9. Laws limiting the number of people allowed to meet in a private home.

10. Any significant change in passport regulations to make passports more difficult to obtain.

11. Wage and price controls, especially in a non-wartime situation.

12. Any kind of compulsory registration with the government of where individuals work.

13. Any attempt to restrict freedom of movement within the United States.

14. Any attempt to make a new major law by executive decree (that is, actually put into effect, not merely authorized as by existing executive orders.)

   President Nixon invoked numbers 1, 11 and 14. As of January 1, 1972, banks must report to the government any deposit or withdrawal over $5,000. That number has since been reduced to $3,000. Any purchase over $10,000 made in cash must also be reported to the federal government. Courts have in some instances ordered individuals without bank accounts to open one under threat of incarceration through charges of Civil contempt.

This government is presently attempting to end private handgun ownership (#2) in America through federal legislation. Recent destruction of Habeas Corpus has made signpost #3 a reality. Federal banking laws have made signpost #4 the law of the land. President Clinton’s “America in Service” legislation has made signpost #6 an expected part of American behavior. Federal civil rights legislation in regard to helping young children deal with alternative life styles of adults (Suzie’s two mommies/daddies) has made signpost #7 a part of the new American landscape. The EPA’s trip reduction legislation, which limits an individual’s right to travel freely on the highway is a perfect example of signpost #13. Road blocks or check points set up by either local or state police under the guise to search for drugs or drunk drivers, while appearing to be in the service of society are in truth an invasion of our freedom to travel.

The truth speaks for itself...........America may be lost....We may now be living under totalitarian rule. Some of us will recognize the truth. Some of us will continue to be in denial of the truth. Too few of us will fight back to regain the freedoms we have lost. The only thing you can be sure of is that this government will continue in its relentless march over whatever may be left of this once great Republic until we are all slaves on the land our fathers fought to make free.

Winston Churchill, speaking to the English people as they were about to become involved in World War II proclaimed:

“If you will not fight for right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival.”

Because the American people have ignored warning after warning, we have finally come to that place in time where we are beginning to ask where our freedoms have gone. Unless we begin to take action now against unconstitutional acts on the part of our elected public servants, we will face a future choice, also described by Mr Churchill. He said:

“There may be even a worse fate. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory, because it is better to perish then to live as slaves.”

2.6 The Mind-Boggling Burden to Society of Slavery to the Federal Income Tax

“Never before have so many drunk so deeply from the poison cup of socialism, licked their lips, and begged for more.” Family Guardian Fellowship

The Great IRS Hoax: Why We Don’t Owe Income Tax, version 4.54
TOP SECRET: For Official Treasury/IRS Use Only (FOUO) Copyright Family Guardian Fellowship http://famguardian.org/
The Gettysburg address is 269 words, the Declaration of Independence is 1,337 words, and the Holy Bible is only 773,000 words. However, the Internal Revenue Code has grown from 11,400 words in 1913, to 7 million words today.

There are at least 480 different tax forms, each with many pages of instructions.

Even the easiest form, the 1040E has 33 pages in instructions, and all in fine print.

The IRS sends out 8 billion pages of forms and instructions each year. Laid end to end, they would stretch 28 times around the earth.

Nearly 300,000 trees are cut down yearly to produce the paper for all the IRS forms and instructions.

American taxpayers spend $200 billion and 5.4 billion hours working to comply with federal taxes each year, more than it takes to produce every car, truck, and van in the United States.

The burden of compliance is the equivalent to a staff of 3 million people working full time for a year, just to comply with the taxes on individuals and businesses.

The IRS employs 114,000 people; that's twice as many as the CIA and five times more than the FBI.

60% of taxpayers must hire a professional to get through their own return.

Taxes eat up 38.2% of the average family's income; that's more than for food, clothing and shelter combined.

AND THAT IS ONLY THE FEDERAL TAX---NOT COUNTING STATE, LOCAL, PROPERTY, SALES TAX, ETC.

2.7 America: Home of the Slave and Hazard to the Brave

"Education is the best security for maintaining liberties, and, 'a nation of well-informed men who have been taught to know and prize the rights which God has given them cannot be enslaved. It is in the region of ignorance that tyranny reigns.'"  
[Benjamin Franklin, Autobiography]

"We have staked the whole future of American Civilization not upon the power of Government, far from it. We have staked the future... upon the capacity of each and all of us to govern ourselves according to the Ten Commandments of God."

[James Madison (1751-1863)]

We used to call America “land of the free and the home of the brave”. Not so anymore. Now the only proper name for it is “land of the slave and hazard to the brave”. A generation of prosperity following WWII, removal of God from the schools and public life by the supreme Court in 1962, disintegrating families caused by widespread defiance of God’s plan for the family in the Bible, and passivity by Christians toward liberalization of our culture has allowed evil to flourish to the severe detriment of everyone in society. It has created a “me generation” which selfishly thinks only about #1, and leaves everyone else, including our own children, up to a gigantic, monolithic and constantly growing totalitarian socialist democratic government.

"Am I my brother’s keeper?"

Where have we heard that before? For a clue, see Gen. 4:9, where Cain, who murdered his brother, said that very same thing. We would argue that most people with that attitude are selfish murderers just like Cain.

At this time in our young country’s history, 70% of Americans now believe there is no absolute standard of right and wrong. This was not always so. Moral relativism, a.k.a. “immorality”, is the result, and it is a cancer on the body politic every bit as evil and insidious as the income tax itself. Is it any wonder then why we now see so much scandal and corruption in political and corporate life? That is what happens when we turn our backs on God: “Self” and an idolatrous government that glorifies “self” then takes over as a counterfeit god. See the article below on our website for more insight on this subject, entitled “The New Jesus Called Tolerance”:  

The Great IRS Hoax: Why We Don’t Owe Income Tax, version 4.54  
TOP SECRET: For Official Treasury/IRS Use Only (FOUO)  
http://famguardian.org/
But we must remember what it means to be brave as Americans. We must be vigilant to protect our liberties by continually doing things that make us worthy to be called “brave” Americans. Here are a few examples of “brave behaviors”:

1. Serve enthusiastically in the military and defend your country and your God-given rights.
2. Serve on jury duty enthusiastically when called so you protect one more person from government abuse caused by a misinformed populace that trusts the attorney general more than he deserves.
3. Don’t steal from the next generation to fund your own high-rolling lifestyle. You should leave more than just a legacy of debt to your children and grandchildren and we all have a moral obligation to leave the world better than we found it. If debt is all you have left them when you die, then your chief gift will be financial slavery to pay off the debt. This applies to both public/government as well as private debts.
4. Watch your elected representatives like a hawk and torment them mercilessly when they get out of line.
5. Involve yourself in political life and/or run for office to make a positive difference in your community.
6. Take 100% responsibility for yourself and don’t rely on any government handout or program, including Socialist Security.
7. When you do something wrong, admit it completely and truthfully and take your licks. We would need far fewer lawyers, courts, and government servants if more people did this.
8. When someone you know and/or love does something wrong, then rebuke them as the Apostle Paul says in Eph. 5:11. If you remain silent when you see people sin, then you have acquiesced to their sin and it will spread.
9. Don’t expect the government to educate your kids properly in the public schools because it is a conflict of interest for them to do so. Put your kids in private schools and petition vociferously for school vouchers to take your hard earned money out of the public schools and put it in the private schools.
10. Help your neighbor and the less fortunate on a routine basis by giving to your favorite charity either your time or money or both.
11. Transmit your values and the lessons you have learned during your long life to your children and grandchildren. This is the most lasting and valuable contribution you can make to the good of mankind.

The above items are what being a “brave” American is all about in our opinion. Those who haven’t done any of the above things frequently or even thought about doing them aren’t “brave” and don’t deserve to be called American for that matter. Socialist maybe, but not brave and not American. This section painfully demonstrates the immediate and direct consequences of not being brave on a large scale: universal slavery to a ruling class, who in America have done an excellent job at making themselves invisible and untouchable so the slaves never wise up and break their chains.

2.7.1 Karl Marx’s Communist Manifesto: Alive and Well In America

“The term ‘world communism’ means a revolutionary movement, the purpose of which is to establish eventually a Communist totalitarian dictatorship in any or all the countries of the world through the medium of an internationally coordinated Communist political movement.”

Most Americans are completely unaware that the graduated income tax we have in America today is the 2nd plank in the 10-plank Communist Manifesto, written by Karl Marx in 1848 as the very blueprint for socialism.
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THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the banks of the state, by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state. The Bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal obligation of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries. Gradual abolition of all the distinction between town and country by a more equitable distribution of the populace over the country.

T. Coleman Andrews, former Commissioner of the Internal Revenue, understood this perfectly as exemplified in the following quote printed in the May 24, 1956 issue of the U.S. News & World Report:

"I don't like the income tax. Every time we talk about these taxes we get around to the idea of 'from each according to his capacity and to each according to his needs'. That's socialism--it's written into the Communist Manifesto. Maybe we ought to see that every person who gets a tax return receives a copy of the Communist Manifesto with it so he can see what's happening to him."

And leaving office, Mr. Andrews began to speak out against what he perceived as being "rapacious tax enactments. In the article he wrote in the April 22, 1956 issue of The American Weekly, he shared these reflections:

"As Commissioner of Internal Revenue I often thought how far we have gone toward excessive and unjust taxation. We have failed to realize, it seems to me, that through our tax system we have been playing right into the hands of the Marxists, who gleefully hail the income tax as the one sure instrument that will bring capitalism to its knees."

Mr. Andrews also explained how special-interest groups have exempted themselves from taxation, and that the true targets of the Internal Revenue Code are the middle class. He stated:

"Whether you believe it or not, everybody is being overtaxed and the middle class is being taxed out of existence, and the nation, thereby, is being robbed of its surest guarantee of continued sound economic development and growth and its staunchest bulwark against the ascendency of socialism."

Probably, one of the finest exposes of special interest groups receiving tax deductions, credits, and partial or total exemptions can be found in the Philadelphia Enquirer in an article called "The Great Tax Giveaway" which ran in that paper April 10th through the 16th, 1988. Thirty-six pages in length, it cited specific passages in the Internal Revenue Code proving that equality in the tax code does not exist.

For example, specific items controlled by specific friends of certain influential congressmen were exempted from particular tax, such as any ship manufactured at certain place on certain date and being of such an exact length and of precisely so many tons. Of course, there was only one vessel in existence that matched these exact criteria. The newspaper ran photographs of the CEO’s of corporations for whom such exclusive legislation was personally written, posing at the end of their mahogany board room tables, smiling from ear to ear.

Author and researcher Gary Allen explains in his landmark book None Dare Call It Conspiracy that Karl Marx was hired by a mysterious group who called themselves the League of Just Men. This secret society was simply an extension of the Order of the Illuminati founded seventy two years earlier on May 1st, 1776 by Adam Wishaupt as an ultra-secret society formed to plan eventual world conquest.

All Marx really did was to codify the same revolutionary plan that had been laid down by Wishaupt. Marx understood that the greatest threat and obstacle to the wealthy ruling class was the middle class, if left affluent enough to afford the leisure
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time to read, study and vigilantly assert and defend its freedoms. But with the wealthy of the middle class gradually eroded through a steady, persistent combination of engineered devaluation of the money supply coupled with a gradual income tax, the majority of families would eventually require not one, but two breadwinners each of whom would likely have more than one job. Sound familiar?

The children of many such families would spend more time most days with teachers in a government funded public school or with day care workers than they would with their own parents. The Census Bureau reports that during the fifteen year period from 1979 to 1994, the top 5% of income earners in the U.S. enjoyed a 45% increase income while the bottom 40% dropped 18.5%. Could this have resulted by sheer accident? Or could it have been planned?

The 10th plank in Marx's Communist Manifesto called for free government funded public education, to ensure that a government's agenda would be inculcated into young minds from kindergarten.

Vladimir Lenin once said:

"Give me your four year-olds and in a generation I will build a socialist state... destroy the family and the society will collapse."

Ironically, isn’t the above exactly what we are doing by:

1. Keeping prayer and God out of the schools (communists are atheists)?
2. Letting the government decide how to educate our children? (letting our children be propagandized)
3. Letting homosexuals and liberals educate them and giving them birth control pills and even abortions at school without telling the parents? (corrupting their morals)
4. Suppressing school choice by preventing school vouchers because of powerful teacher union lobbies that slander school voucher campaigns every time they get on the ballot, for instance in California and Michigan in the most recent election of 2000?

2.7.2 Public (Government) Schooling

"Give me your four year-olds and in a generation I will build a socialist state ... destroy the family and the society will collapse."

[Vladimir Lenin]

"Above all things I hope the education of the common people will be attended to; convinced that on their good sense we may rely with the most security for the preservation of a due degree of liberty."

[Thomas Jefferson to James Madison, 1787. Madison Version FE 4:480]

"Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppressions of body and mind will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day."

[Thomas Jefferson to Pierre Samuel Dupont de Nemours, 1816. ME 14:491]

"Our schools have been scientifically designed to prevent overeducation from happening. The average American (should be) content with their humble role in life, because they're not tempted to think about any other role.”

[U.S. Commissioner of Education, William T. Harris, 1889]

"The children who know how to think for themselves spoil the harmony of the collective society that is coming, where everyone would be interdependent. [1899]

Independent self-reliant people would be a counterproductive anachronism in the collective society of the future where people will be defined by their associations.”

[John Dewey, educational philosopher, proponent of modern public schools, 1896]

"A general State education is a mere contrivance for molding people to be exactly like one another; and as the mold in which it casts them is that which pleases the dominant power in the government, whether this be a monarch, an aristocracy, or a majority of the existing generation; in proportion as it is efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by a natural tendency to one over the body."

[John Stuart Mill, 1859]
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"Every child in America entering school at the age of five is insane because he comes to school with certain allegiances toward our Founding Fathers, toward his parents, toward our elected officials, toward a belief in a supernatural being, and toward the sovereignty of this nation as a separate entity. It's up to you, teachers, to make all these sick children well by creating the international child of the future."

[Chester Pierce, a Professor of Educational Psychiatry at Harvard]

"Education is what you must acquire without any interference from your schooling."

[Mark Twain]

Under the Department of Education's Goals 2000 and Outcome Based Education programs, today's public schools more often than not emphasize how the student feels about learning rather than the acquisition of such basic skills as reading, writing, arithmetic and analytical thinking. Math and verbal S.A.T. scores have steadily plummeted since 1963 when federal legislation placed psychiatrists, psychologists and their programs directly into the public schools. Supreme court rulings around that time also took prayer and God out of the schools, making them essentially into breeding grounds for atheistic evolutionists teaching. 100 points were recently added to all S.A.T. scores across the board in an attempt to make up for this national embarrassment.

Has the psychiatric profession had a role in the process of converting our public schools into government funded, mental health laboratories? Consider that there is now a large set of officially categorized psychiatric disorders for public school children. Find a diagnostic pigeonhole to place the student in, and the school becomes eligible for federal funding. One disorder is known as Opposition Defiance Disorder which in my day was simply talking back to parents or teachers. Another is Arithmetic Dysphoric Disorder, where a child may be slow in learning math. Another diagnosed malady is the now famous Attention Deficit Disorder.

How about you? Did you ever exhibit any of these behaviors as a child during certain developmental stages? Did you ever talk back, fidget or fail to complete an assignment? Were you a little slow in learning trigonometry? Whatever happened to tutoring?

And what is today's solution? Make that behavior into a disease or a mental illness and prescribe a mind altering drug for it! Over two million public school students are currently on Ritalin and other mind altering drugs. Is there an agenda behind this?

GET YOUR CHILDREN OUT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AS FAST AS YOU CAN!

2.7.3 The Socialist’s Plan to Make America Communist

"For every new mouth to feed, there are two hands to produce."

[Peter T. Bauer]

"Intelligence and wisdom differ in that the former is the understanding of a thing and the latter is the judgment of the thing understood. Thus, the problem with Leftists isn't stupidity, but a lack of wisdom. In essence, Leftism is intelligence without wisdom, which is a poison without an antidote."

[Barrett Kalellis]

So it would appear that the 10th plank of Karl Marx's Communist Manifesto calling for government controlled public school education has pretty well been nailed down, too. And just how well have Marx's other planks been implemented in modern America?

You might find it interesting to note that all ten planks have now been fully installed. The absolute right to inheritance has been compromised through estate taxes, although such taxes are being misapplied against citizens within the states of the union since they are a direct tax on property and, as such, are prohibited under Article 1, Section 2, Clause 3 of the Constitution as we will learn later.

The absolute right to the ownership of private property has been obliterated through laws allowing dozens of federal agencies to seize private property with no charges brought against the owner, in total violation of the 5th Amendment which states that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation.
As much as the television- and internet pornography- and sports-addicted citizenry of our country—supposedly the greatest and freest on earth—don’t want to believe it, government-sanctioned theft happens every day. So I guess the first of Marx’s ten planks, abolition of private property, is pretty well in place, too.

As to Marx’s remaining planks, the centralization of credit in the hands of a national bank and the central planner’s control over the means of communication, transportation, production, agriculture and labor are all firmly in the grip of the Federal Reserve System, the Federal Communications Commission, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Energy, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Labor.

Normal Thomas, for many years the U.S Socialist Presidential candidate, once stated:

*The American people will never knowingly adopt socialism. But, under the name of ‘liberalism’, they will adopt every fragment of the socialist program, until one day America will be a socialist nation, without knowing how it happened.*

In 1928, Thomas wrote a pamphlet titled *Democratic Socialism* in which he stated:

”...here in America, more measures once praised and denounced as Socialist have been adopted than once I should have thought possible, short of a Socialist victory at the polls.”

In the Congressional Record for April 17, 1958, Thomas is quoted as stating:

”The United States is making greater strides toward Socialism under Eisenhower than ever under Roosevelt, particularly in the fields of federal spending and welfare legislation.”

And in the October 19, 1962 issue of the *Cleveland Plan Dealer*, Thomas is quoted as follows:

”The difference between Democrats and Republicans is [that] Democrats have accepted some ideas of Socialism cheerfully, while Republicans have accepted them reluctantly.

I believe it was the former Premiere of the Soviet Union, Nikita Kruschev, who stated that communism was merely socialism in a hurry.

### 2.7.4 The Commie Lesson

”There’s only one way to kill capitalism—by taxes, taxes, and more taxes.”  
[Karl Marx]

I ACTUALLY AM A VISITOR FROM ANOTHER PLANET. This is not too hard to believe, as my critics, who are many, will tell you without blushing that I am definitely something from another planet.

Now, correct me if I’m wrong, I am told that you people spend somewhere approaching a quarter Trillion dollars a year (that’s 250 Billion with a "B" dollars per year) on a military establishment. And I was in the restaurant here, being from outer space, I was talking to this fellow, who told me he was a Christian, and he apparently thought this was great.

So I asked him, "why do you spend all this money?"

And he scratched his head, and said "Well gee, now that the Soviet Union is all dissolved, I don’t know."

I said "well, why did you used to spend a quarter Trillion dollars a year on your military establishment?" And he said "Oh! We wanted to defend ourselves from communism!"

And I asked "what is communism?"

And he said "Communism is a foreign and alien ideology that threatens by military force to impose itself over our objection and against our will."

I thought that was kind of interesting, and I told him that I know a little something about communism, and I asked him if he knew what communism was and he said, "well, no".
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And I asked him if he had been trained in the public schools, and he said "yes." So I walked him through the communist manifesto, as I will you now.

The communist manifesto was created by a fellow named Moses Mordecai Levi. You Americans out here know him as Karl Marx, he was the son of a rabbi, and I asked why this guy went by an alias? The discussion fairly quickly elevated to the status level of Battle-Stations Missile:

I said, "The first plank of the communist manifesto is:

Abolition of all property and land ownership and the application of all rents for public purposes."

And I asked this Christian, "Do you own your own home?"

He said "Yep."

I said, "What happens if you stop paying the property tax?"

He said "The sheriff will sell it."

I said, "I am woefully confused, of course, I am from another planet. How can the sheriff sell what you own?"

He was sorrowfully silent. So I said "Isn't it a fact that you hold title and that you are not an "allod" on the land and that's why they can move your butt off of it when you don't pay their rent?" And as he stared into the ceiling, I said "If you pay property tax you practice the first plank of the communist manifesto. On the spaceship down here I was reading this big thick book called the Bible, the Bible you Christians use, and I understand that you are in violation of Leviticus 25:23 if you do that."

He looked puzzled...

The second plank of the communist manifest is: Heavy progressive income tax.

You people don't fill out Illinois state form 1040's here do you, and you don't fill out form 1040's for the federal government do you? Because if you do, you practice the second plank of the communist manifesto and you are in violation of your Bible at Malachi 3:8 and Deuteronomy 4:13.

He loosened his tie...

I said the third plank of the communist manifesto is: Abolition of all rights of inheritance.

I said "How long have you lived in Illinois?" He said "All my life." I said "You don't have any probate courts here, do you? You don't have a legal profession that is wall to wall teaching you to fill out wills instead of create trusts, do you? Because if you know anyone who has been through probate court, or if you have personally been through probate court, you have practiced the third plank of the communist manifesto and you are in violation of Deuteronomy 21:15-17 and Numbers 18:20-24." He loosened his tie a little more...

The fourth plank of the communist manifesto is: Confiscation of property of all immigrants & rebels.

"You don't turn on the TV around April 1st in Illinois and see them drag some tax protestor off to jail, do you?" "Annually," was the reply. "Well", I said, "if you participate in that or allow that to happen, or if that has happened to you, that's the fourth plank of the communist manifesto, and it is a violation of Leviticus 26:17 and Proverbs 28:1." His eyes started to glaze over.

I looked at him and said the fifth plank of the communist manifesto is: Centralization of credit by the creation of a national bank.

I said, "You pay your debts at law, in silver, don't you? You don't discharge your obligations in equity, do you?" He started to squirm. I said "If you rely on this green paper money for your sustenance, if your mind thinks in terms of this green paper..."
when you go to purchase things, you practice the fifth plank of the communist manifesto, and you are in violation of Leviticus 19:35-36, Deuteronomy 25:13-16 and the aforementioned nasty and nefarious Exodus 20:15.

EXODUS 20:15 reads “THOU SHALT NOT STEAL.”

He started to become uneasy....

I said, the sixth plank of the communist manifesto is: Centralization of the means of communication & transport in the hands of the state.

“You don't have ports of entry out here on the Interstate, do you? Your trucks don't have to drive in and out of these scales, do you? You don't drive automobiles with the admiralty flag of the state of Illinois on the back with the yearly rental fee stuck in the middle on a sticker, do you? Because if you do, you practice the sixth plank of the communist manifesto and you are in violation of Deuteronomy 7:2 and Exodus 23:32-33.” He started to fidget uncomfortably.

I said the seventh plank of the communist manifesto is: Government control of factories and the instruments of production owned by the state; the bringing in to cultivation of wastelands and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.

I said, “You don't have a Bureau of Land management, do you? You don't live under the administrative circumstance of the Department of Agriculture, do you? And you don't have companion circumstances in the state law along with EPA and a host of other things, because if you allow yourself to live under that system, you practice the seventh plank of the communist manifesto and you are in violation of Leviticus 25:1-7, actually Leviticus 25:1-10. He closed his eyes.

I said the eight plank of the communist manifesto reads: Equal obligation of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

I said, "Do you have a Social Security number?" He shook his head up and down sorrowfully, I said "well doesn't that mean that you're a fourteenth Amendment juristic person a merchant in interstate commerce under contract over time for profit and gain in a regulated enterprise and you have waived all your constitutional rights under contract in exchange for privileges, franchises and immunities?" He said "Privileges?" I said "yes, privilege! PRIVATE LAW: Privilege." He put his chin in his solar plexus. I said "If you have a Social Security number, you practice the eighth plank of the communist manifesto, and you are in violation of your Bible at Leviticus 19:13 and Deuteronomy 24:14&15." He became physically agitated.

Number nine, I said: A combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries. Gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by a more equitable distribution of population over the country.

"You don't have a Federal Emergency Management Agency in Illinois. Do you? You don't have FEMA at the state level, do you? Because if you do, you practice the ninth plank of the communist manifesto and you're in violation of Leviticus 25:1-7. By this time he was just plain angry.

I finished by quoting the tenth plank of the communist manifesto: Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of Children’s factory labor in its present form. Conform education with industrial productions.

I said "Are you a homeowner?" He said "yeah." I said "you pay the property tax?" He said "Yeah." I said "Do you know where 75% of the property tax goes in this state?" He said "no." I said "It goes to support the public school system. I looked at him, I said "You don't tithe your children to the state, do you? You raise them at home the way Yahweh told Moses to tell you to do, don't you?" As he got up and walked away, I said "If you support the public education establishment, you are in violation of Deuteronomy 4:9-10, Deuteronomy 6:1-25 and Deuteronomy 11:19. And you practice the tenth plank of the communist manifesto."

And I went and got him and brought him back and sat him down and I said "You know, I am from outer space and one of the reasons they sent me to this planet is that I'm not the brightest firecracker that ever went off in our galaxy. But what I'm trying to figure out is why the hell would you spend 250 Billion "Dollars" a year defending yourselves against something that you willfully and premeditatively do, under the color of law, and practice every second of every minute of every hour of every day all year long?"
He said, "My God, I never thought about that! What do you think we should do?"

I said, "I don't know. Did the communists ever run a presidential candidate?" He said, "Oh yeah, Gus Hall, the venerable ancient 80 year old president of the communist party used to run every time until the Democrats took over the Congress after WWII."

I said to him, "If Gus Hall would have been elected President of the United States, do you think he would have abolished property tax, do you think he would have abandoned the income tax, do you think he would have instructed the legal profession to only create trusts for families to hold property in, and that he would have abolished the probate courts? Do you think he would have stopped the incarceration of so-called Tax rebels? Do you think Gus Hall would have closed the federal reserve? Do you think he would have shut down the federal communications commission and allowed you to flip through the dials on your TVs here in Chicago and watch television stations unlicensed by the government? Do you think he would have eliminated all the bureaucracies that control trade, commerce, business, industry and agriculture? Do you think he would have dumped the Social Security Administration and admitted that there was no trust fund, and that the whole thing was just a gigantic chain letter used to alter your citizenship status in the thirties and redistribute your wealth? That Roosevelt, he was a pretty crafty guy, wasn't he?"

I said "Do you think Gus Hall would have closed the public school system and sold the public schools back to the families in the neighborhoods wherein they existed?" As I opened up the copy of the Bible the motel clerk told me I could keep for free, my Christian friend got up and left, and I couldn't bring him back.

The above is a transcript of a tape by:

Peter Jon Simpson
Erwin Rommel School of Law
c/o P O Box 211
Atwater, Minnesota 56209-0211
320- 857 - 2400
2401 fax
rommellaw@aol.com
http://members.aol.com/rommellaw

"The Law is the Weapon
the Courtroom the Battlefield
the Judge is Your Enemy
Your Lawyer is an Enemy Spy"

2.7.5 IRS Secret Police/KGB in Action!

"The tax collector must love poor people--he's creating so many of them."
[Bill Vaughan]

"In a free society, government protects citizens from threats against their persons and property. In a police state, government deploys its law enforcement assets to protect itself against the "threat" posed by its own subjects."
[W.N. Grigg]

The following article was extracted off the MSN Money website verbatim. It helps to show that the IRS doesn't hesitate to use the same tactics as the Communists to enforce the payment of its slave tax, the income tax. Recall that the Communists in the Soviet Union made everyone into informants by paying family members to snitch on each other! Would anyone argue that isn't exactly what is going on below?

IRS pays informants to squeal on tax cheats
While it may seem Orwellian, thousands of people each year take advantage of the IRS program. Here's how it works.
By Jeff Schnepfer
http://moneycentral.msn.com/articles/tax/basics/5399.asp

"He's dead meat if he doesn't pay me. I won't sue him . . . I'll destroy him with one phone call!"

Don't make Dave Cohen angry.

The Great IRS Hoax: Why We Don't Owe Income Tax, version 4.54
TOP SECRET: For Official Treasury/IRS Use Only (FOUO) Copyright Family Guardian Fellowship http://famguardian.org/
Dave is a New Jersey tax attorney. His clients pay their bills or they suffer the hell of an IRS civil and criminal investigation. What Dave does is clearly unethical (that's why we can't use his real name), but he can't be caught. Dave is a snitch for the IRS.

Dave had a client who was a restaurant owner. He gave Dave a $1,000 cash deposit, but refused to pay the balance of his bill. The restaurant owner was pocketing lots of cash income that never made it to his tax return -- a clear civil and criminal violation. As an attorney, Dave couldn't publicly violate attorney-client privilege, so he had a friend call the IRS with enough information to start an investigation.

**Swarms of agents descend**

Tips are important to the IRS. Annually, it collects more than $100 million and pays out from $2 million to $5 million to snitches. If you've ever heard the horror stories about the invasiveness of a normal IRS audit, they pale in comparison to a criminal investigation.

In the case of the not-so-innocent restaurant owner, swarms of agents descended upon and paralyzed his business. For the next nine months, the owner endured the torture of Treasury agents peeling away every layer of his financial life, resulting in multiple thousands of dollars in taxes, fines, penalties and interest.

He avoided jail only by hiring another attorney to negotiate a settlement with the IRS. The non-paying owner ended up spending more money on legal fees than on the tax he should have paid originally.

Dave's friend even received a substantial reward for the information. And, of course, Dave's legal bill was finally paid.

**Motive isn’t profit but revenge**

While the Internal Revenue Service doesn't publicly encourage tax informers, its representatives admit that many investigations couldn't be successfully conducted, or even started, without the use of paid informants or the direct purchase of evidence.

Most informants are former employees of a business that has been underreporting its income. A disgruntled employee who doesn't inform on the business itself may squeal on its owner or a disliked manager.

A neighbor who objects to your loud stereo at midnight or becomes jealous of your new car each year may just as quickly turn informer. The emotional whirlpool of divorce is another great breeding ground for IRS informants, so be kind to your former spouse.

Anyone who provides information that leads to the detection and punishment of any violation of the tax code may be eligible for a reward (except for federal workers who get the information in pursuit of their duties). However, don't think this is the path to riches. Since 1960, only about 8% of filed claims have resulted in rewards.

**How to claim a reward**

IRS Publication 733 details the regulations for claiming a reward. You must complete Form 211, Application for a Reward for Original Information, which can be requested from the IRS by calling (800) TAX-FORM. Neither document is available on the IRS Web site. Your information can be delivered personally to any IRS office, or in writing to:

Head of the Criminal Investigation Division
Internal Revenue Service
Washington, DC 20224

If a recovery is made as a direct result of information you provided, you may qualify for a reward of 15% of the amount recovered including taxes, fines and penalties, but not interest -- with a maximum payment of $2 million.

If your information was valuable, although not specific, in determining liability, you may be rewarded with as much as 10% of the amount recovered, again with a $2 million cap.

If your information was the originating cause of the investigation, but had no direct relationship to the determination of tax liability, the reward is 1% of the amount recovered, again with that $2 million limit.

**Using an assumed name**

If you're not claiming a reward for the information, you can use an assumed name. But if you want to claim a reward, you must use your own name. The IRS is legally prohibited from disclosing the identity of an informer to unauthorized persons.
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The IRS heard from 9,530 informants and paid out 650 rewards totaling $3.5 million in the fiscal year ending Sept. 30, 1996, the most recent year for which statistics were available. In that year, the IRS collected an extra $102.7 million in taxes, fines and penalties because of the informants.

No matter what you tell the IRS, and no matter how much they collect, all rewards are discretionary, not mandatory. The IRS is never obligated to pay a reward, unless you negotiate a signed contract in advance of providing the information. Moreover, all rewards are taxable income.

Reasons why a reward might not be paid include:

- The information was of no value, or
- The information was already known by the IRS, or
- The information was available in public records.

Rewards are paid only after the tax is recovered, and that can take as long as five years or more. The informant isn't kept posted as to the progress of the investigation, but can check to see if the claim for a reward is still under active IRS consideration.

The idea of informing on neighbors, colleagues or business associates is distasteful to most people; it's Orwellian. Yet, it's the honest taxpayer who winds up paying for tax fraud, and it's not just nickels and dimes. The IRS estimates that the gap between taxes owed and taxes paid is $127 billion. That's $1,000 extra in taxes for every individual return filed last year.

And by the way, I always pay "Dave."

2.7.6 U.S. Government Communists Can Legally Install Surreptitious Tracking Devices on Your Car!

IRS Criminal Tax Bulletin number 200007002 reveals that the communist IRS has authority from our corrupt courts to install electronic tracking devices on your vehicle to learn everything they want about where you travel. Here is the summary of the court ruling from their bulletin:

No Fourth Amendment Violation in Placing a Tracking Device on a Suspect's Vehicle

In United States v. McIver, 186 F.3d. 1119 (9th Cir. 1999), United States Forest Service officers identified McIver's vehicle from surveillance video taken of a marijuana patch located in a national forest. They traced the tag and learned McIver's address. The officers surreptitiously placed two tracking devices on the undercarriage of McIver's vehicle which was parked outside his residence. McIver ultimately was convicted of conspiracy to manufacture marijuana and appealed his conviction to the Ninth Circuit arguing, among other things, the warrantless placement of the tracking devices on his vehicle constituted an unreasonable search and seizure.

Though a question of first impression, the Ninth Circuit found adequate precedent to rule the placement of the devices on the vehicle did not constitute a search. There is no reasonable expectation of privacy in the exterior of a car because the exterior of a car is thrust into the public eye and thus to examine it does not constitute search. United States v. Class, 475 U.S. 106 (1986). The undercarriage is part of the car's exterior, and as such, is not afforded a reasonable expectation of privacy. United States Rascon-Ortiz, 944 F.2d. 749 (9th Cir. 1993). Here, the officers do not pry into a hidden or enclosed area and McIver produced no evidence to show he intended to shield the undercarriage of his vehicle from inspection by others.

The court also rejected McIver's assertion that the placement of the devices on the vehicle constituted an unlawful seizure. In United States v. Kar, 468 U.S. 706 (1986) the Supreme Court held a "seizure" occurs when there is some meaningful interference with an individual's possessory interests in property. The Karo court ruled the placement of a beeper in a car of either before selling and tracking it to the suspect, was at most a technical trespass on the space occupied by the beeper and was or marginal relevance to establishing constitutional violation. Applying this principle, the Ninth Circuit found McIver presented no evidence the device deprived him of dominion and control of his vehicle or caused any damage to the electronic components in the vehicle. Thus, no seizure occurred because there was no meaningful interference with McIver's possessory interest in the vehicle.

If you want to read the above bulletin yourself, refer to the address below:


We live in a police state, folks. The communists have already taken over! There is a clear violation of the Constitution, ethics, and morality here, no matter how technical the courts got on the issue to evade the truth. The First Amendment...
guarantees us a right of free speech and free expression. That right includes the right to NOT communicate with your government. What the government has done in the above anecdote, not unlike what the Communists did in the Soviet Union, is created a society of snitches and informants by turning both people and things against others. The Soviets used people as informants and our communist U.S. government is just a little more sophisticated than that: they engineer and employ things instead of people as snitches, but the result is the same: violation of the First Amendment right to NOT communicate with your government. George Orwell’s 1984 book predicted this kind of tyranny would happen and it’s in our midst now. What are we going to do about it? Recall that in Orwell’s book, a camera watched your every move in your own home and if you did anything unauthorized, the government would persecute and punish you. Today’s government is doing exactly that already by making a person’s property into a snitch and an informant on its owner. This transgression will become increasingly important in a computer and technological age, where no doubt the government will eventually try to install ID chips inside of people and pass laws to force software manufacturers to program their applications to snitch on their owners. This causes one’s “property”, in effect to “express” the location of its owner to the government, and this violates “freedom of expression” guaranteed by the First Amendment. Freedom of expression involves more than just speaking, it involves any type of communication or conveyance of intelligence or information, including computer transmissions, radio transmitters, and GPS tracking device records: all of these devices express information about the owner of the property to the government in an unwanted manner.

Expression. 1 a: an act, process, or instance of representing in a medium (as words): UTERANCE <freedom of ~ b (1): something that manifests, embodies, or symbolizes something else <gift of my admiration for you> (2): a significant word or phrase (3): a mathematical or logical symbol or a meaningful combination of symbols (4): the detectable effect of a gene; also EXPRESSIVITY 2 a: a mode, means, or use of significant representation or symbolism: expr. felicitous or vivid indication or depiction of mood or sentiment <read the poem with ~ b (1): the quality or fact of being expressive (2): facial aspect or vocal intonation as indicative of feeling 3: an act or product of pressing out—expressional.

The natural right of the ownership of “property” includes the right of “enjoyment” of it. Look at the definition of “property” and see for yourself:

“Property. That which is peculiar or proper to any person; that which belongs exclusively to one. In the strict legal sense, an aggregate of rights [including First Amendment rights] which are guaranteed and protected by the government. Fulton Light, Heat & Power Co. v. State, 65 Misc.Rep. 263, 121 N.Y.S. 536. The term is said to extend to every species of valuable right and interest. More specifically, ownership; the unrestricted and exclusive right to a thing; the right to dispose of a thing in every legal way, to possess it, to use it, and to exclude every one else from interfering with it [including causing it to communicate or express your whereabouts]. That domination or indefinite right [unlimited, including the right to NOT communicate with your possessions] of use or disposition which one may lawfully exercise over particular things or subjects. The exclusive right of possessing, enjoying, and disposing of a thing. The highest right a man can have to anything; being used to refer to that right which one has to lands or tenements, goods or chattels, which no way depend on another man’s courtesy…”

“Property embraces everything which is or may be the subject of ownership, whether a legal ownership, or whether beneficial, or a private ownership…” [Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, pp. 1216-1218]

How can the owner of property “enjoy” having property that snitches on him or her? The only thing that kind of ownership implies is anxiety and fear of government persecution. This is clearly tyranny and must be stopped, folks! It impinges on our sovereignty and makes us live a life of fear and oppression. The exercise of one right, that is the right of property, cannot and should not imply the oppression or denigration of any other right, and especially if that oppression of other rights, such as First Amendment rights, was not done deliberately and willfully by the owner of the property. In the above case, the exercise of property rights by the owner became a means to eliminate other rights of the owner, in this case First Amendment rights, and this case makes the whole Bill of Rights inconsistent with itself and eliminates the possibility that all of our rights can peacefully coexist together without impingement from the government. In the words of the Supreme Court, the purpose of the Bill of Rights is to “keep the government off our backs.” How does the above ruling further that end?

“The First Amendment was designed to allow rebellion to remain as our Heritage. The Constitution was designed to keep the government off the backs of the people. The Bill of Rights was added to keep the precincts of belief and expression, of the press, of political and social activities free from surveillance. The Bill of Rights was designed to keep agents of government and official eavesdroppers away from Assemblies of People. The aim was to allow men to be free and independent to assert their rights against government. There can be no influence more paralyzing of that objective than Army [government] surveillance. When an intelligence officer looks over every nonconformist’s shoulder in the library, or walks invisibly by his side in a picket line, or infiltrates his club...
Sources of Government Tyranny and Oppression

"Society in every state is a blessing, but government, even in its best state is but a necessary evil; in its worst state, an intolerable one."

[Thomas Paine (1737-1809)]

How did we get to be a socialist/communist country full of people who are slaves and serfs to an invisible ruling class of politicians and bankers in Washington D.C.? What are the means they used to enslave us? Below is a succinct list of the six main weapons they used to enslave us, and they are all propaganda weapons. In a free country where open violence is a criminal act, these are the only weapons you can use without blatantly violating the law and exposing yourself to negative political repercussions:

1. **Presumption:** The government will steal ordinary terms from out language, create a legal definition for them that is entirely different from the common usage, and then encourage people to continue using the common definition of the term, usually at great injury to themselves. People don’t bother to verify or ask the basis for the definition of the terms the government is using because they inherently “trust” the government, which we will show is a BIG mistake. In effect, the government “steals” our language and uses it to enslave us. The feds did this with the terms “United States”, “State”, “U.S. citizen”, “employee”, “income”, “individual”, “trade or business”, and “tax” in the Internal Revenue Code, for instance, as you will see later in section 3.9.1 and following. The way to fight this kind of presumption is that whenever you are communicating with a representative from the government,

   1.1. Precisely define all of the important terms you are using in correspondence you send.

   1.2. For the terms they send or things they say, demand that they provide either a definition for the terms they are using out of only the law (so it doesn’t depend on the whims of a man). If they won’t, you can assume they are trying to deceive you and that you should read the law and expouse their constructive fraud by complaining to their supervisor and to your elected representatives.

   “The greatest enemy of the truth is very often not the lie - deliberate, contrived and dishonest - but the myth - persistent, persuasive and unrealistic.”

   [President John F. Kennedy, at Yale University on June 11, 1962]

2. **Partial truth:** The courts do not tell the whole truth in their rulings. For instance, they don’t document their “presumptions” about their jurisdiction, the physical location of the property they are ruling on (which is the federal zone for most federal rulings), your citizenship status, or your “taxpayer” status in their rulings, because if they did, they would not only make themselves criminally liable for conspiracy against rights, but would also undermine efforts to expand the illegal enforcement of income tax and their jurisdiction.

   “The secret of success is sincerity. If you can fake that, you’ve got it made!”

3. **Deception:** Courts and politicians are famous for deception relating to jurisdiction or income taxes, because both are the source of their power. This explains why politicians and lawyers are at the bottom of the credibility list in every poll of the American public. The Office of Law Revision Counsel (L.R.C., see [http://uscode.house.gov/uscode.htm]) of the House of Representatives, which is responsible for amending the U.S. Codes, has progressively and deliberately obfuscated the Internal Revenue Code, Title 26 of the U.S. Code, to conceal the truth from the average American that the law does not require them to pay income taxes. In effect, the LRC is abusing the law to make it a vehicle for propaganda.

   “The law is anything that can be boldly asserted and plausibly maintained.”

   [Michel S. Josephson, Bar Review Course, 1979]

4. **Silence:** Politicians, lawyers, and IRS agents will remain silent when questioned about matters in this book, or will respond with a form letter totally unrelated to the subject matter of your inquiry. That way, they can at least “look” like they tried to help you but in fact, tried to contribute to deceiving you or maintaining your ignorance of the law and your rights. Courts do the same thing: when the U.S. Supreme Court gets an appeal or “writ of certiorari” from a circuit or state court relating to income taxes that clearly violates the constitutional rights of an American and relates to a matter
obviously outside their jurisdiction, they will deny the appeal and not explain why. This is called a “sin of omission”, which is an abrogation of a legal duty by a failure to act.

“Silence is a species of conduct, and constitutes implied representation of the existence of facts in question. When silence is of such character, and under such circumstances that it would become a fraud, it will operate as an Estoppel.”
[Carmine v. Bowen, 64 A. 932]

5. Fear: The effect of the above tactics are magnified and spread and encouraged through fear. After IRS has twisted the arms of private employers by misinforcing and misrepresenting the nature of bogus levies and liens, then they will use the fear of the private employers to enslave their employees. The private employers will be so scared not to comply with the IRS that they will either fire employees who refuse to withhold or provide Socialist Security Numbers or blatantly discriminate against them by refusing to accept their W-8 or W-4 Exempt forms stopping withholding. They will also use fear within families by using the security instinct that females have and playing this against the male in the family who is the breadwinner and wants to either stop withholding or paying.

6. Envy. The original income tax had its roots in 1909, when the Sixteenth Amendment was sent to the states for ratification. If you read through the Congressional Record of debates surrounding the Sixteenth Amendment, the Democrats of that time used envy of the wealth of big corporations as an excuse to introduce the income tax amendment. In effect, they slandered and vilified the “robber barons” like J.P. Morgan, Carnegie, etc. so that the average American thought they had outrageous wealth and should share it with everyone else. In effect, the Democrats tried to turn the government into an agent of plunder in order to equalize outcomes instead of opportunity. This is a recipe for socialism.

“A tax, in the general understanding of the term and as used in the constitution, signifies an exaction for the support of the government. The word has never thought to connote the expropriation of money from one group for the benefit of another.”
[U.S. Supreme Court in United States v. William M. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936)]

“A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote themselves money from the Public Treasury. From that moment on, the majority always votes for the candidate promising the most benefits from the Public Treasury with the result that a democracy always collapses over loose fiscal policy always followed by dictatorship.”
[Alexander Fraser Tytler, “The Decline and Fall of the Athenian Republic”]

All of the above weapons are employed through the use of a liberal American Media Machine and through the obfuscation of the law, and they are facilitated and encouraged by your own ignorance and apathy generated in you by a communist public school system that is run by the government. Only among the human species are parents stupid enough to turn over their children to be raised and propagandized by their enemies. The following subsections will expand upon the above elements or tools for tyranny by which we have been deceived and subsequently enslaved.

2.8.1 Deception: The Religion of SATAN and our government

Question: How can you tell if either a lawyer or a politician are lying?

Answer: Their lips are moving.
[Anonymous]

Satan is referred to by many names throughout the Bible, as indicated below:

1. Lawless one (2 Thess. 2:3-17)
2. Adversary (1 Pet. 5:8)
3. Accuser (Rev. 12:10)
4. Wicked one (Matt. 13:19)
5. Murderer (John 8:44)

In his essence, Satan is a false accuser, a slanderer, an adversary, and a liar. Satan’s chief weapon in perpetrating his opposition to the will of God is deception.

“You are of your father the devil, and the desires of your father you want to do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and does not stand in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaks a lie, he speaks from his own resources, for he is a liar and the father of it.”
[John 8:44, Bible, NKJV]
Chapter 2: U.S. Government Background

The definition of “Devil” further explains these conclusions from Strong’s Concordance of the Bible:

Devil, diabolos (dee-ab-ol-oss). This adjective, which literally means “slanderous”, is derived from the verb diaballo, “to bring charges with hostile intent” (justly or slanderously, usually the latter). Although diabolos retains its adjectival meaning occasionally in the NT (1 Tim. 3:11; Titus 2:3), in most instances it is used substantively as a proper name for a specific “slanderer”—the “devil” (Matt. 4; Luke 4; Eph. 6:11). This use of the word is already established in the Septuagint, where it occurs frequently as a translation of the Heb. Satan (“adversary”). The association of the “devil” with Satan continues in the NT (e.g., John 13:2, 27; Rev. 20:2).

(Strong's #1228)

Obviously, in order to successfully slander someone, one must be a bold, arrogant, conceited, and convincing liar. In some cases, people make such evil into a profession. They walk around with suits and ties and briefcases slandering their opponents in front of juries, judges, and the media using lies and charging exorbitant amounts for their dis-service to society. The name of such professions are:

1. Politicians
2. Democrats
3. Judges
4. Attorneys
5. Lawyers

respectively! The only profession ever criticized in the bible by Jesus was the practice of law, as a matter of fact, and now you know why. Also keep in mind that the majority of politicians and nearly all judges are or were also lawyers. See Matt. 23:23 to learn what Jesus thought of these people, and it’s not pretty!

The following scripture compares and contrasts liars from the righteous to help you discern them:

“He who speaks truth declares righteousness,
But a false witness deceit.
There is one who speaks like the piercings of a sword,
But the tongue of the wise promotes health.
The truthful lip shall be established forever,
But a lying tongue is but for a moment.
Deceit is in the heart of those who devise evil.
But counselors of peace have joy.
Lying lips are an abomination to the Lord,
but those who deal truthfully are His delight.”
[Prov. 12:17-22, Bible, NKJV]

“The righteous man hates lying.”
[Prov. 13:5, Bible, NKJV]

The Apostle James explains what Satan’s religion is, which is Deception, in James 1:26:

“If any among you thinks he is religious, and does not bridle his tongue but deceives his own heart, this one’s religion is useless.”
[James 1:26, Bible, NKJV]

Notice that James above would appear to have referred to “deception” as a religion and he called it “useless”. Other versions of the bible replace the word “useless” with “vain”. Vanity is sometimes synonymous with “pride”. It was Satan’s pride that caused him to rebel against God and slander God.

“In the mouth of a fool is a rod of pride.
But the lips of the wise will preserve them.”
[Prov. 14:3, Bible, NKJV]

“Pride goes before destruction, and a haughty spirit before a fall. Better to be of a humble spirit with the lowly, than to divide the spoil with the proud.”
[Prov. 16:18-19, Bible, NKJV]
Our politicians and their slavery mongers and Mafioso extortionists at the IRS have the same motives as Satan: pride and covetousness, which are manifested or evidenced by slander, lies, and deception. Satan coveted God’s power and authority and he wanted to be God and replace God. Everything he does is a cheap imitation of God’s true sovereignty and is based on deceit and deception. He is a rebel at heart and he lusts after God’s power. Our politicians are no different: they lust after power and prestige, which means they can’t act like the public servants that they are. They commonly try to deceive their constituents into thinking, for instance, that they are the equivalent of gods and kings. They want you to think that they are the sovereigns and you are the servants, even though you will find out later in chapter 4 that the opposite is actually true, and the only reason people believe otherwise is their own legal ignorance. The scumbag politicians and lawyers do this by boldly going around and lying about their authority and what the law says. And if the law too clearly states the truth, then they will try to obfuscate it so that you have to rely on them to “interpret” it for you, and what do you think they are going to say that it says: “They are the sovereigns and you are ‘subject to’ them and their laws”. And when the truth comes out occasionally about how very little authority they really have, then they try to silence the messenger rather than agree with the message using the press and lots of false propaganda. The Department of Justice has a whole section of their website devoted to such deceptive LIES and propaganda at the web address below:

http://www.usdoj.gov/03press/03_1_1.html

Power in the political realm is summarized in one word: jurisdiction. Politicians know that most of their power and jurisdiction derives from economic means. To the extent that they control the money is the extent to which they think that they run the country. They use money as a means to create “privilege-induced slavery”, where they make it a “taxable privilege” to receive some kind of government benefit or a “privilege” in order to keep the money that is rightfully yours, and then they force you to do something under the color of law in order to qualify for the “privilege”. Unfortunately, the things that they make into “privileges” are your “rights”, which means you have no liberties left after they fiddle with the laws!

When you do your research and uncover their lies and their fraud, since they don’t want to be exposed or convicted for committing perjury or fraud, then they instead will create a big bureaucracy to respond to your issues to make it at least “appear” that they are “trying” to help you, and then they deliberately make it so big and inefficient and wasteful and unresponsive that it never responds to any of your concerns. That way, what is really an evasion of the truth, an outright acquiescence to a lie, a constructive fraud, and an oppression of your rights looks far more innocuous and can be described with far gentler words like “inefficiency” and “bureaucracy” and “an opportunity for improvement”. They will hire “clerks” within these bloated bureaucracies to respond who are so under-qualified and underpaid that they make easy scapegoats for the fraud of their superiors. Then when you litigate and expose the fraud to juries, they will do the same thing that Satan tries to do: slander and discredit and murder your character with lies and threaten the judge with an audit and collection activity if he doesn’t go along with the game. This is the very definition of evil, if you ask us, and the foundation of it is the religion of deception that perpetuates the power, the money, and the prestige that so many politicians covet but seldom obtain. The Bible in 2 Tim. 3:1-9 describes all of the personality characteristics of the kind of warped people we have elected to be our contemporary politicians and the kind of DOJ lawyers that they have working for them to perpetrate such EVIL:

“But know this, that in the last days perilous times will come: for men will be lovers of themselves, lovers of money, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, unloving, unforgiving, slanderers, without self-control, brutal, despisers of good, traitors, headstrong, haughty, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God, having a form of godliness but denying its power [God’s sovereignty over them and the government]. And from such people turn away! For of this sort are those who creep into households and make captives of gullible women loaded down with sins, led away by various lusts, always learning and never able to come to the knowledge of truth. Now as Jannes and Jambres resisted Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of corrupt minds, disapproved concerning the faith; but they will progress no further, for their folly will be manifest to all, as theirs also was.”
[2 Tim. 3:1-9, Bible, NKJV]

The bible also describes the collective governments and corrupted politicians in them who are at war with God because of their evil deceit, sinfulness, and idolatry described above. It calls them the “beast” in the book of Revelation.

“And I saw the beast, the kings [political rulers] of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against Him [God] who sat on the horse and against His army.”
[Revelation 19:19, Bible, NKJV]

Incidently, it is this same “beast” that issues its mark to all its followers: the Socialist Security Number. What makes the “beast” to be at war with God is the vain use of the religion of deception and the encouragement of the sheep in God’s flock to practice idolatry toward government by making government into a false god.
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People in government want to be worshipped and feared just like the God they are imitating and competing with, so they will make the people afraid for their safety and then offer their false power and sovereignty and protection as a cheap substitute for the real God. Remember, the purpose of governments, like God, is to protect the people. God goes one step beyond government by actually loving the people too, in fulfillment of the second greatest commandment found in Matt 22:39. Atheist and socialistic governments forget that part of their stewardship and in so doing, destroy the people and the countries they are there to protect because of their greed and lust. In the process of imitating and trying to replace God, these covetous and proud and selfish politicians slap the real God in the face and give the people a false sense of security.

"PRESS RELEASE: WASHINGTON, D.C.

The U.S. government announced today that it is changing its emblem to a condom. The President explained that the condom more clearly reflects the government's political stance. A condom stands up to inflation, halts production, destroys the next generation, protects a bunch of pricks, and gives you a sense of security while it's actually screwing you."

"Let no one deceive you by any means: for the Day will not come unless the falling away comes first, and the man of sin is revealed, the son of perdition [Satan], who exalts himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped so that he sits as God in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. [does this sound like our politicians in their piouness in Washington, D.C.]

"Do you not remember that when I was still with you I told you these things? And now you know what is restraining, that he may be revealed in his own time.

"For the mystery of lawlessness is already at work: only He [God] who now restrains will do so until He is taken out of the way. And then the lawless one [Satan] will be revealed, whom the Lord will consume with the breath of His mouth and destroy with the brightness of His coming. The coming of the lawless one [Satan] is according to the working of Satan, with all power, signs, and lying wonders, and with all unrighteous deception among those who perish, because they did not receive the love of the truth, that they might be saved [don't be one of them!] And for this reason God will send them strong delusion [from their own government], that they should believe a lie, that they all may be condemned who did not believe the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

[2 Thess. 2:3-17, Bible, NKJV]

And keep in mind that the phrase "the love of the truth" means the love of God's law and His word in the Bible and the saving faith that it originates from. Paul again warns us not to either deceive or be deceived in the book of Colossians:

"Do not lie to one another, since you have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the new man who is renewed in knowledge according to the image of Him who created him."

[Col. 3:9, Bible, NKJV]

"Beware lest anyone cheat you through philosophy and empty deceit, according to the tradition of men, according to the basic principles of the world, and not according to Christ."

[Col. 2:8, Bible, NKJV]

Psalm 52 in the Bible also describes what will happen to people who disregard Paul's admonition and deceive anyway:

"Why do you boast in evil, O mighty man? The goodness of God endures continually, Your tongue devises destruction.
Like a sharp razor, working deceitfully.
You love evil more than good, Lying rather than speaking righteousness,"
You love all devouring words,  
You deceitful tongue.

God shall likewise destroy you forever;  
He shall take you away, and pluck you out of your dwelling place,  
And uproot you from the land of the living.  
The righteous also shall see and fear,  
And shall laugh at him, saying,  
"Here is the man who did not make God his strength,  
But trusted in the abundance of his riches,  
And strengthened himself in his wickedness."

But I am like a green olive tree in the house of God;  
I trust in the mercy of God forever and ever.  
I will praise You forever,  
Because You have done it;  
and in the presence of Your saints  
I will wait on Your name, for it is good."

[Psalm 52, Bible, NKJV]

Why do Americans tolerate deceit from their government? The answer is simple: They have turned away from God and no longer use their faith in God as the primary arbiter of truth and morality, and this is even true of professed “Christians.” Scientific statistics powerfully confirm this conclusion. George Barna of Barna Research (http://www.barna.org) has done a poll of Americans on how they come to conclusions about right and wrong and truth and morality at:


His findings are surprising and you should look at them in order to determine and understand why Americans are so willing to trust and believe a lying government. Below is an excerpt from his article:

Americans are Most Likely to Base Truth on Feelings

Americans unanimously denounced the September 11 terrorist attacks as a textbook example of evil, suggesting that there is a foundational belief in an absolute standard of right and wrong. Subsequent research, however, has shown that in the aftermath of the attacks, a minority of Americans believes in the existence of absolute moral truth. Even more surprising, the data from a pair of nationwide studies conducted by the Barna Research Group of Ventura, California showed that less than one out of three born again Christians adopt the notion of absolute moral truth. The surveys also found that few Americans turn to their faith as the primary guide for their moral and ethical decisions.

Truth Is Relative, Say Americans

In two national surveys conducted by Barna Research, one among adults and one among teenagers, people were asked if they believe that there are moral absolutes that are unchanging or that moral truth is relative to the circumstances. By a 3-to-1 margin (64% vs. 22%) adults said truth is always relative to the person and their situation. The perspective was even more lopsided among teenagers, 83% of whom said moral truth depends on the circumstances, and only 6% of whom said moral truth is absolute.

The gap between teen and adult views was not surprising, however, when the adult views are considered by generation. While six out of ten people 36 and older embraced moral relativism, 75% of the adults 18 to 35 did so. Thus, it appears that relativism is gaining ground, largely because relativism appears to have taken root with the generation that preceded today’s teens.

The Barna study also showed that there is a racial component to this issue, as well. Among whites, 60% endorse relativism, compared to 26% who adopt absolutism. Among non-whites, however, 74% support relativism and just 15% believe in absolute morality. (Fifteen percent of Hispanic adults and only 10% of African-American adults contended that moral truth is absolute.)

Not surprisingly, born again Christians were more likely than non-born again individuals to accept moral absolutes. Among adults, 32% of those who were born again said they believe in moral absolutes, compared to just half as many (15%) among the non-born again contingent. Among teenagers, there was still a 2-to-1 ratio evident, but the numbers were much less impressive: only 9% of born again teens believe in moral absolutes versus 4% of the non-born again teens.

Moral Decision-Making
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The surveys also asked people to indicate the basis on which they make their moral and ethical decisions. Six different approaches were listed by at least 5% of the teenagers interviewed, and eight approaches were listed by at least 5% of adults. In spite of the variety communicated, there was a clear pattern within both groups. By far the most common basis for moral decision-making was doing whatever feels right or comfortable in a situation. Nearly four out of ten teens (38%) and three out of ten adults (31%) described that as their primary consideration.

Among adults, other popular means of moral decision-making were on the basis of the values they had learned from their parents (15%), on the basis of principles taught in the Bible (13%), and based on whatever outcome would produce the most personally beneficial results (10%).

Teenagers were slightly different in their approach. One out of six (16%) said they made their choices on the basis of whatever would produce the most beneficial results for them [is it any surprise why we have Enrons with this kind of attitude? Standby for MORE!]. Three alternative foundations were each identified by one out of ten teens: whatever would make the most people happy, whatever they thought their family and friends expected of them, and on the basis of the values taught by their parents. Just 7% of teenagers said their moral choices were based on biblical principles.

Once again, the age pattern was evident. People 36 or older were more than twice as likely as adults in the 18- to-35 age group to identify the Bible as their basis of moral choices (18% vs. 7%). The proportion of young adults who selected the Bible as their primary moral filter was identical to that of teenagers. In contrast, more than half of the young adults (52%) and teenagers (54%) base their moral choices on feelings and beneficial outcomes compared to just one-third of adults 36 and older who do so (32%). [SCARY!]

The racial pattern was evident on this matter, too. White adults were nearly three times as likely as non-white adults to base their moral choices on the Bible (17% vs. 6%). Blacks were four times more likely than whites (23% vs. 6%), and Hispanics were more than twice as likely as whites (16% vs. 6%) to base their moral decisions on the potential benefits of their choice.

What It Means

These figures were cited by George Barna, whose firm conducted the research, as a major reason underlying the data he released in a controversial recent public presentation about the moral views and behaviors of Christians. In that forum, which is now available on videotape from Barna Research ("Morality and the Church"), Barna noted that substantial numbers of Christians believe that activities such as abortion, gay sex, sexual fantasies, cohabitation, drunkenness and viewing pornography are morally acceptable. "Without some firm and compelling basis for suggesting that such acts are inappropriate, people are left with philosophies such as 'if it feels good, do it,' 'everyone else is doing it' or 'as long as it doesn't hurt anyone else, it's permissible.' In fact, the alarmingly fast decline of moral foundations among our young people has culminated in a one-word worldview: 'whatever.' The result is a mentality that esteems pluralism, relativism, tolerance, and diversity without critical reflection of the implications of particular views and actions."

Barna emphasized the importance of the data related to the views of teenagers and the born again population. ‘Just one out of ten of our country’s born again teenagers believe in absolute moral truth - a statistic that is nearly identical to that of non-born again teens. Christian families, educators and churches must prioritize this matter if the Christian community hopes to have any distinctiveness in our culture. The virtual disappearance of this cornerstone of the Christian faith - that is, God has communicated a series of moral principles in the Bible that are meant to be the basis of our thoughts and actions, regardless of our preferences, feelings or situations - is probably the best indicator of the waning strength of the Christian Church in America today.”

The researcher stated that the difference in truth views between born again and non-born again adults was statistically significant, but not much to cheer about. “When a majority of Christian adults, including three out of four born again Baby Busters, as well as three out of four born again teens proudly cast their vote for moral relativism, the Church is in trouble. Continuing to preach more sermons, teach more Sunday school classes and enroll more people in Bible study groups won’t solve the problem since most of these people don’t accept the basis of the principles being taught in those venues. The failure to address this issue at its root, and to do so quickly and persuasively, will undermine the strength of the church for at least another generation, and probably longer.”

Barna also reported that compared to a similar study his firm conducted a decade ago, the basis of people’s moral and ethical decisions these days is more likely to be feelings and less likely to be the Bible.

The above very disturbing research simply confirms that the faith and convictions of Christians, much less Americans, toward God have gone sour. Christians have sold out to a corrupted culture and a corrupted world, and the sincere ones who rely on God’s word are dying out as the statistics show. They are no longer “sanctified” and set apart by their faith (see John 17:13-19) and simply go to church for entertainment and convenience and vanity. Their prosperity has corrupted them and
their churches have become social clubs and mutual admiration societies instead of being the salt and light of the world to bring the Lord’s truth and justice and mercy. They are therefore heading for HELL and have become disobedient to God’s commandments:

“Woe to the rebellious children,” says the Lord. “Who take counsel, but not of Me, and who devise plans, but not of My Spirit, that they may add sin to sin; who walk to go down to Egypt, and have not asked My advice, to strengthen themselves in the strength of Pharaoh, and to trust in the shadow of Egypt! Therefore the strength of Pharaoh shall be your shame, and trust in the shadow of Egypt shall be your humiliation...

Now go, write it before them on a tablet, and note it on a scroll, that it may be for time to come, forever and ever:

that this is a rebellious people, lying children, children who will not hear the law of the Lord; who say to the seers, “Do not see;” and to the prophets, “Do not prophesy to us right things; Speak to us smooth [politically correct] things, prophesy decrees. Get out of the way, turn aside from the path, cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us. ”

Therefore thus says the Holy One of Israel:

“Because you despise this word, and trust in oppression and perversity, and rely on them, therefore this iniquity shall be to you like a breach ready to fall, a bulge in a high wall, whose breaking comes suddenly, in an instant. And He shall break it like the breaking of the potter’s vessel, which is broken in pieces; He shall not spare. So there shall not be found among its fragments a shard to take fire from the hearth, or to take water from the cistern.”

[Isaiah 30:1-3, 8-14, Bible, NKJV]

But the Lord has a much higher calling for us all:

“If you love me, keep My commandments. And I will pray the Father, and He will give you another Helper, that He may abide with you forever—the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees Him nor knows Him; but you know Him, for He dwells with you and will be in you.”

[John 14:15-17, Bible, NKJV]

Barna’s research explains where we must begin if we are to fix our corrupted culture and reform our churches to put them back on track. We can’t fix our government until we fix ourselves because the government is US since we are the sovereigns!

“We have met the enemy, and he is US!”

Don’t go pointing the finger at our government until you have your OWN act together first, or you will be despised as a hypocrite and railroaded in front of juries and judges by the government’s wicked lawyers. This very brand of state-sponsored terrorism is precisely how our government keeps the sheep in line and enslaved to the income tax, as a matter of fact.

Americans no longer trust God as the absolute, unquestioned, and exclusive source of all moral truth, but instead prefer to vainly trust their “feelings”, “science”, a so-called heathen “expert”, or their idolatrous government above and beyond their God. This violates the first commandment revealed by Jesus in Matt. 22:36-38 and also the following scripture:

“Trust in the Lord with all your heart. And lean not on your own understanding [or your own feelings]; In all your ways acknowledge Him [not just in the ways that FEEL good or are politically correct], and He [not the winds of public opinion] shall direct your paths.”

[Prov. 3:5, 6, Bible, NKJV]

If you want to know what God does to idolaters who are like the majority of Americans today that Barna described above, then read the books of Ezekial and Judges to get some fear and respect for God. This may not be a message that most people want to hear, but it is at the heart of why God gave us a deceitful government and why we are being punished for our unbelief: we are reaping what we sowed. 9 The book of Judges especially shows what happens to a culture that trusts in man and the flesh and their own feelings rather than in God for their sense of morality. Below is an excerpt from our bible introducing the Book of Judges to make the moral lessons contained in the book crystal clear:

The Book of Judges stands in stark contrast to Joshua. In Joshua an obedient people conquered the land through trust in the power of God. In Judges, however, a disobedient and idolatrous people are defeated time and time again because of their rebellion against God.

9 See Gal. 6:7, which says: “Do not be deceived, God is not mocked: for whatever a man sows, that he will also reap.”
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In seven distinct cycles of sin to salvation, Judges shows how Israel had set aside God’s law and in its place substituted “what was right in his own eyes” (21:25). The recurring result of abandonment from God’s law is corruption from within and oppression from without. During the nearly four centuries spanned by this book, God raises up military champions to throw off the yoke of bondage and to restore the nation to pure worship. But all too soon the “sin cycle” begins again as the nation’s spiritual temperance grows steadily colder.

... 

The Book of Judges could also appropriately be titled “The Book of Failure.”

Deterioration (1:1-3:4). Judges begins with short-lived military successes after Joshua’s death, but quickly turns to the repeated failure of all the tribes to drive out their enemies. The people feel the lack of a unified central leader, but the primary reasons for their failure are a lack of faith in God and lack of obedience to Him (2:1-2). Compromise leads to conflict and chaos. Israel does not drive out the inhabitants (1:21, 27, 29, 30); instead of removing the moral cancer [IRS, Federal Reserve?] spread by the inhabitants of Canaan, they contract the disease. The Canaanite gods [money, sex, covetousness] literally become a snare to them (2:3). Judges 2:11-23 is a microcosm of the pattern found in Judges 3-16.

Deliverance (3:5-16:31). In verses 3:5 through 16:31 of the Book of Judges, seven apostasies (fallings away from God) are described, seven servitudes, and seven deliverances. Each of the seven cycles has five steps: sin, servitude, supplication, salvation, and silence. These also can be described by the words rebellion, retribution, repentance, restoration, and rest. The seven cycles connect together as a descending spiral of sin (2:19). Israel vacillates between obedience and apostasy as the people continually fail to learn from their mistakes. Apostasy grows, but the rebellion is not continual. The times of rest and peace are longer than the times of bondage. The monotonous cycle of Israel’s sins can be contrasted with the creativity of God’s methods of deliverance.

Degeneracy (17:1-21:25). Judges 17:1 through 21:25 illustrate (1) religious apostasy (17 and 18) and (2) social and moral degeneracy (19-21) during the period of the judges. Chapters 19-21 contain one of the worst tales of degradation in the Bible. Judges closes with a key to understanding the period: “everyone did what was right in his own eyes” (21:25) [a.k.a. “what FEELS good”]. The people are not doing what is wrong in their own eyes, but what is “evil in the sight of the Lord” (2:11).

[The Open Bible, New King James Version, Introduction to the Book of Judges]

Just like the depravity and corruption that happened to the Israelites in the Book of Judges because of relying on their own desires instead of God’s commands as their guide, the price for the vain sin of moral relativism that Barna describes happening right here in America as we speak will be eventual deception and damnation for many.

“The coming of the lawless one is according to the working of Satan, with all power, signs, and lying wonders, and with all unrighteous deception among those who perish, because they did not receive the love of the truth [God’s truth], that they might be saved.”

[2 Thess. 2:9-12, Bible, NKJV]

And for this reason God will send them strong delusion, that they should believe the lie, that they all may be condemned who did not believe the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness.”

[2 Thess. 2:9-12, Bible, NKJV]

Unless God is the foundation of all truth and unless He is our absolute source of truth and our moral compass in everything we do, then this country is doomed to believe the BIG LIE mentioned earlier in 2 Thess. 2:3-17. Recall that here is what God said on this subject:

“I am the way, the [only moral] Truth, and the life. No one comes to the father but by me.”

[John 14:6, Bible, NKJV]

Finally, let us not forget the words of our beloved founder George Washington on this subject in his Farewell Address:

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness—these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, “where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?” And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.
Chapter 2: U.S. Government Background

It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

There can be no religion and morality without absolute truth, and God is the only source of moral truth. Wake up, people!

Diligent followers of Christ who have taken the time to read and study the law and the truth of God will recognize the government deception and obfuscation for what it is and will publicly expose and condemn it. They will also take the time to reveal the results of their discovery to the public and the mass media as we have done here so that such harmful untruths do not spread like a cancer and destroy our society and our freedoms:

“Be diligent to present yourself approved to God, a worker who does not need to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. But shun profane babblings for they will increase to more ungodliness. And their message will spread like cancer.”

[2 Tim. 2:15-17; Bible, NKJV]

2.8.2 Presumption

“The greatest enemy of the truth is very often not the lie - deliberate, contrived and dishonest - but the myth - persistent, persuasive and unrealistic.”

[President John F. Kennedy, at Yale University on June 11, 1962]

The purpose of lying is to develop in the hearts and minds of the hearers a false presumption. The more ignorant and unwise and godless the hearers, the more likely they are to believe this false presumption. Those who promote such lies will do so for selfish reasons but ultimately their purposes are harmful and hateful.

“A lying tongue hates those who are crushed by it, and a flattering mouth works ruin.”

[Prov. 26:28, Bible, NKJV]

Most frequently, we also acquire false presumptions by less dishonest or more casual means. For instance, we acquire false presumptions mainly from the media and our associates in our normal interactions. This method is the most popular technique used by our government to brainwash the sheep, I mean people. When our government does it, it is called “propaganda”.

The reason more informal techniques such as this are most successful is that we just accept what people say without thinking critically about it and without questioning it. We are among people and organizations that we supposedly love or trust and so our intellectual defenses are down. In effect, we are intellectually lazy and don’t bother to process or analyze new ideas or look what God’s word says about them before we commit them to our memory banks as truth.

Another very popular propaganda tool for creating false presumptions are the public schools which are run by our government. Good parents will take the time to counteract the myths and false presumptions that liberal teachers will try to program our children with, but Satan still gets his foot in the door because many children grow up in single parent families where the one parent who is present doesn’t have the energy to counteract the government brainwashing on a regular basis.

The Bible has some very convicting things to say about presumption that every Christian ought to teach their children, and which should also be part of the jury instructions that every jury hears:

“Who can understand his errors? Cleanse me from secret faults. Keep back Your servant also from presumptuous sins; Let them not have dominion over me. Then I shall be blameless, and I shall be innocent of great transgression.”

[Psalm 19:12-13; Bible, NKJV]

Evidently, being presumptuous is a sin for which God takes offense. Our King James Bible has a footnote under the above passage that says: “The right response to God’s revelation is to pray for His help with errors, faults, and sins.” That same passage above under the word “presumptuous” then points to Num. 15:30, which tells the rest of the very telling story on this subject:

“But the person who does anything presumptuously, whether he is native-born or a stranger, that one brings reproach on the Lord, and he shall be cut off from among his people.”
So evidently, we’re dealing with very serious sin here, folks. Presumption evidence is a very big offense to the Lord. If you further research the meaning of “presumptuous”, you will find in Numbers 14:44 that it means defiance and disobedience to God’s laws, the Bible, His commandments, and His will revealed to us by the Holy Spirit, and through His prophets.

The bedrock of our system of jurisprudence is the fundamental presumption of “innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt”. The Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution then guarantees us a right of due process of law. Fundamental to the notion of due process of law is the absence of presumption of fact or law. Absolutely everything that is offered as proof or evidence of guilt must be demonstrated and revealed with evidence, and nothing can or should be based on presumption, or especially false presumption. The extent to which presumption is used to establish guilt is the extent to which our due process rights have been violated. Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, on page 500 under the term “due process” confirms these conclusions:

“If any question of fact or liability be conclusively be presumed [rather than proven] against him, this is not due process of law.”


In our legal system, our government goes out of its way to create and perpetuate false presumptions to bias the legal system in their favor, and in so doing, based on the above, they commit a grave sin and violation of God’s laws. The only reason they get away with this tyranny in most cases is because of our own legal ignorance along with corrupted government judges and lawyers who allow and encourage and facilitate this kind of abuse of our due process rights. Below are some examples of how they do this:

1. False presumptions that the Internal Revenue Code is law. The Internal Revenue Code has not been enacted into positive law. It says that at the beginning of the Title. Any title not enacted into “positive law” is described as “prima facie evidence” of law. That means it is “presumptive” evidence that is rebuttable:

“Prima facie. Lat. At first sight on the first appearance; on the face of it; so far as can be judged from the first disclosure; presumably; a fact presumed to be true unless disproved by some evidence to the contrary. State ex rel. Herbert v. Whims, 68 Ohio.App. 39, 38 N.E.2d. 596, 499, 22 O.O. 110. See also Presumption.”


Since Christians are not allowed to presume anything, then they can’t be allowed to presume that the Internal Revenue Code is “law” or that it even applies to them. Technically, the Internal Revenue Code can only be described as a “statute” or “code”, but not as “law”. Here is the way the Supreme Court describes it:

“To lay, with one hand, the power of the government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms.

Nor is it taxation. ‘A tax,’ says Webster’s Dictionary, ‘is a rate or sum of money assessed on the person or property of a citizen by government for the use of the nation or State.’ ‘Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the Legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes.’ Cooley, Const. Lim., 479.”

[Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 (1874)]

Law is evidence of explicit consent by the people. For a statute to be enacted into positive law, a majority of the people or their representatives must consent to it by voting in favor of it. When a statute is not enacted into positive law, this simply means that the people never collectively and explicitly consented to the enforcement of it. Consequently, they cannot be expected to accept any adverse impact on their rights that such legislation but not “law” might have on them. In a system of government based only on consent of the governed such as we have, such “legislation” and “presumptive evidence of law” is unenforceable and becomes mainly a political statement of public policy that acquires the “force of law” only by consent. This is a polite way of saying that the Internal Revenue Code is simply an unenforceable, state-sponsored federal voluntary religion that has no force on the average American. Like the Bible itself, the Internal Revenue Code therefore only applies to people who volunteer or choose to “believe” in or accept its terms. To treat the I.R.C. any other way is essentially to hurt your neighbor and disrespect his sovereignty and his rights. Christians don’t force things upon others who never consented. People in the legal profession and the tax profession will readily and frequently sin all the time by making false presumptions about the liability of people under Internal Revenue Code and they will falsely assume that the I.R.C. is “law”. Indirectly, they are falsely “presuming” that the target of the IRS
enforcement action “consented”, which is a complete lie in most cases. This type of presumptuous behavior is forbidden to Christians under God’s law because it violates the second great commandment to love our neighbor and not hurt him (see Bible, Gal. 5:14). Consequently, the Internal Revenue Code cannot be treated as “law” by Christians and shouldn’t be treated as “law” by the courts either. To do so would constitute sin and idolatry toward any judge that might try to coerce either jurists or the accused to make such “presumptions”. Since the I.R.C. is “presumptive evidence” of law, the easy way to disprove that it is law is to demand evidence that the people consented to it. The Supreme Court said the Sixteenth Amendment didn’t constitute evidence of consent. The Congress cannot enact a law that applies in states of the Union without explicit evidence of consent found in the Constitution, and there is none according to the Supreme Court, as you will learn later in sections 0 and following. If you would like to know more about the subject of the Internal Revenue Code not being “law”, see sections 5.4.1 through 5.4.1.4 later.

2. **IRS authority to make assessments or to change your self-assessment presumptions.** Because our income tax system is based on voluntary self-assessment and payment, according to the Supreme Court in *Flora v. United States*, 362 U.S. 145 (1960), then the only person who can assess you, a natural person, with a liability under Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code is YOU and only YOU and the only person who can file a return with your name on it is you. The IRS’ own Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 5.1.11.6.8 clearly shows that Substitute For Returns (SFRs), which are returns filed in place of those which “taxpayers” refuse to file, cannot be filed for any specific of 1040 forms (1040, 1040A, 1040EZ, etc) and the reason is because the tax is voluntary, which is to say more properly that it is a DONATION and not a TAX. Once you make this “assessment” as authorized by 26 U.S.C. §6201(a)(1) and send it in, the IRS has no lawful authority to change or adjust the assessment, even if they believe you made an error, without your permission! You can search for implementing regulations under 26 C.F.R. 1.X until the cows come home and you won’t find a regulation that authorizes them to change your self-assessment! Your average misinformed American, however, naturally “assumes” that the IRS has the authority to change it whether you want to or not. If the IRS then finds that you did make an error, they will “presume” that they have the lawful authority to change it by typically sending back a revised assessment and give you a certain amount of time to respond or protest it before it becomes cast in stone. When they do this, they are basically asking you for permission to make the change, and your silence or acquiescence constitutes implied consent to the change. This whole scheme works in the IRS’ favor because of the ignorance of the average American about what the law really says. It seems that too many people have been relying on IRS publications rather than reading the law for themselves. BUT, you can shift this contemptible situation completely around the other way in your favor by knowing the law! All you have to do is attach to your return specific instructions stating specifically and clearly that the IRS:

- May NOT change or especially increase the amount of “income” on the return without invalidating EVERYTHING on the return and causing you to withdraw your consent. This makes the return to be filed under duress and inadmissible as evidence in court according to the Supreme Court in *Weeks v. United States*, 232 U.S. 383 (1914).
- May not rely on hearsay evidence of receipt of funds from employers in the form of W-2 or 1099 forms, because they are not authenticated with a notary affidavit.
- May not file a Substitute for Return (SFR) in place of your return because there is no statute or implementing regulation authorizing it and section 5.1.11.6.10 of the Internal Revenue Manual does not allow it either.
- Should not assume that the form or ANY information on it is accurate if the form IN TOTAL is not accurate and acceptable AS SUBMITTED.
- Is not authorized to “propose” any changes, only to file the return IN TOTAL in your administrative record and send you a letter explaining what they disagree with and the authorities (statutes and regulations and IRM sections and Supreme Court rulings) their determination is based on.
- If they protest the amount of “income” on the return, must provide a definition of “income” that is consistent with the following web address and with the Constitutional definition made by the Supreme Court: [http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/income.htm](http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/income.htm)
- Any protests or disagreements they make must include a cite of the specific statutes AND implementing regulations AND the section from the Internal Revenue Manual which document and authorize their position or their position be will presumed in the absence of evidence to the contrary to be illegal, unlawful, not authorized by law, null and void, and frivolous.
- May not cite any court case below the Supreme Court as justification for their position, based on the content of their own Internal Revenue Manual.
- May not institute penalties because they violate the prohibition on Bills of Attainder under Article 1, Section 9, Clause 3 of the Constitution and because such penalties can only apply to employees of a corporation per 26 C.F.R. §301.6671-1(b), which you are not until proven otherwise, with EVIDENCE.
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If you use the above tactics and file a return with a 1 cent “income” and ask for all your money back, that along with the above tactics will drive the average IRS agent bonkers and he simply won’t know what to do and he will have no choice but to give you ALL your withheld tax back!

3. Presumption of correctness of IRS assessments. The federal courts assume that the IRS’ assessments are correct, but the IRS must provide facts to support the assessment and it must appear on an IRS 23C Assessment Form that is signed and certified by an assessment officer.

“The tax collector’s presumption of correctness has a Herculean masculinity of Goliathlike reach, but we strike an Achilles’ heel when we find no muscles, no tendons, no ligaments of fact.”
[Portillo v. C.I.R., 932 F.2d. 1128 (5th Cir. 1991)]

“Presumption of correctness which attends determination of Commissioner of Internal Revenue may be rebutted by showing that such determination is arbitrary or erroneous.”
[United States v. Hover, 268 F.2d. 657 (1959)]

However, the presumption of correctness is easily overcome by looking at the government’s own audits of the IRS. We have several documents on our website from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) showing that the IRS is unable to properly account for its revenues or protect the security of its taxpayer records. Presenting these reports in court is a sure way to derail the presumption of correctness of any alleged assessment the IRS may say they have on you. You can examine these reports for yourself on our website at:
http://famguardian.org/PublishedAuthors/Govt/GAO/GAO.htm

4. Legitimate authority presumptions: When an IRS agent or investigator contacts someone to investigate a tax matter, the average Joe six-pack citizen “presumes” that they have authority to do what they are doing. After all, the agent will pull out a rather official looking “pocket commission” that makes it look like they are official. However, in most cases this pocket commission is an “Administrative” commission issued to administrative IRS employees who have no authority whatsoever to be doing any kind of enforcement actions such as investigations, seizures, liens, and levies. Administrative pocket commissions are easily recognizable because they have a serial number that begins with the letter “A”, indicating that they are Administrative rather than “E”, which means Enforcement. Enforcement Pocket Commissions are black instead of Red in color. We cover this in section 5.4.9 later. Whenever you talk with an IRS agent in person or on the phone, demand to see their pocket commission and get the serial number of their pocket commission for your records so you can sue the bastard if he illegally institutes collection actions in violation of 26 U.S.C. §7433 and 26 U.S.C. §7214.

When they appear or call for questions, tell them you are really glad to see them and say that you will be cooperating fully with them AFTER they answer your questions first which will prove they have authority to be doing what they are doing. This amounts to a conditional acceptance and it will be very hard for them to argue with you. This is the way that you can “question authority” if you have an IRS agent breathing down your neck. Then when they start answering your questions about their authority to investigate, grill them on camera or using a tape recorder with witnesses present in the room using the following on our website at:
Tax Deposition Questions, Family Guardian Fellowship
http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Deposition.htm

5. Court jurisdiction presumptions. If you appear in front of a federal court that has no jurisdiction over you and you make a general appearance and do not challenge jurisdiction, you are “presumed” to voluntarily consent to the jurisdiction of the court, even though that court in most cases doesn’t have any jurisdiction whatsoever over you, including in personam or subject matter jurisdiction. Your ignorant and/or greedy attorney won’t even tell you that you have the option to make a special appearance instead of a general appearance or to challenge jurisdiction because it would threaten his profits and maybe even his license to practice law. You have to know this, and what you don’t know will definitely hurt you! However, even some federal courts admit the real truth of this matter:


“If parties do not raise question of lack of jurisdiction, it is the duty of the federal court to determine the matter sua sponte. 28 U.S.C.A. §1332.”

“Lack of jurisdiction cannot be waived and jurisdiction cannot be conferred upon a federal court by consent, inaction, or stipulation. 28 U.S.C.A. §1332.”
6. U.S. Supreme Court “cert denied” presumptions. We talk about this scandal in detail later in section 6.7.1 where we talk about the Certiorari Act of 1925. When a case is lost at the federal district or circuit court level, frequently it is appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court on what is called a “writ of certiorari”. When the Supreme Court doesn’t want to hear the case, they will “deny the cert”, which is often abbreviated “cert denied”. A famous and evil and unethical tactic by the IRS and DOJ is to cite as an authority a “cert denied” and then “presume” or “assume” that because the Supreme Court wouldn’t hear the appeal, then they agree with the findings of the lower court. An example of that tactic is found in the IRS’ famous document on their website entitled The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments, for instance, which we rebuted on our website at: http://famguardian.org/PublishedAuthors/Govt/IRS/friv_tax_rebuts.pdf. However, this fallacious logic simply is not a valid presumption or inference to make absent a detailed explanation from the Supreme Court itself of why they denied the cert, and frequently they won’t explain why they denied the appeal because it would be a public embarrassment for the government to do so! For instance, if a person declares themselves to be a “nontaxpayer” and a “non-resident non-person”, does not file a return, and challenges the authority of the IRS and litigates his case all the way up to the Supreme Court to prove that the IRS has no assessment authority on him, do you think the Supreme Court is going to want most Americans to hear the truth by ruling in his favor and causing our income tax system to self-destruct? Rule 10 of the U.S. Supreme Court reveals some, but not all of the reasons why they might deny a cert., but there are a lot more reasons they don’t list, and the rule even admits that the reasons listed are incomplete. The bold-faced type emphasizes the point we are trying to make here:

Rule 10. Considerations Governing Review on Writ of Certiorari

Review on a writ of certiorari is not a matter of right, but of judicial discretion. A petition for a writ of certiorari will be granted only for compelling reasons. The following, although neither controlling nor fully measuring the Court’s discretion, indicate the character of the reasons the Court considers:

(a) a United States court of appeals has entered a decision in conflict with the decision of another United States court of appeals on the same important matter; has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with a decision by a state court of last resort; or has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court’s supervisory power;

(b) a state court of last resort has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with the decision of another state court of last resort or of a United States court of appeals;

(c) a state court or a United States court of appeals has decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court, or has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court.

A petition for a writ of certiorari is rarely granted when the alleged error consists of erroneous factual findings or the misapplication of a properly stated rule of law.

In the above, DISCRETION=REASON. The above list of reasons, by the court’s own admission, is incomplete. Furthermore, there is no U.S. Supreme Court rule that says they have to list ALL their reasons for not granting a writ. This very defect, in fact, is how the government has transformed us into a society of men and no laws, in conflict with the intent of the founding fathers expressed in Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803):

“The Government of the United States has been emphatically termed a government of laws, and not of men. It will certainly cease to deserve this high appellation if the laws furnish no remedy for the violation of a vested legal right.”

[Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803)]

So don’t let the IRS trick you into “assuming” that the supreme court agreed with them if an appeal was denied to it from a lower court that was ruled in the IRS’ favor. The lower courts are obligated to follow the precedents established by the Supreme Court but frequently they don’t. Rulings against gun ownership and the pledge of allegiance in 2002 coming from the radical and socialist Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals are good examples that contradict such a conclusion.
7. “U.S. citizen” presumptions. There is a very common misconception that we are all “U.S. citizens”. In most cases, judges will insist that the only way that you cannot be one is if you meet the burden of proving that you aren’t. As you will learn later in section 4.12.12 and subsections, this presumption is completely false and is undertaken to illegally pull you inside the corrupt jurisdiction of the federal courts in order to rape and pillage your liberty and your property.

“Unless the defendant can prove he is not a citizen of the United States, the IRS has the right to inquire and determine a tax liability.”


8. Social Security Number presumptions. The Treasury Regulations in 26 C.F.R. contain a presumption that if you have a Socialist Security Number, then you must be a “U.S. citizen”:

26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1(g)

(g) Special rules for taxpayer identifying numbers issued to foreign persons—

(1) General rule—

(i) Social security number. A social security number is generally identified in the records and database of the Internal Revenue Service as a number belonging to a U.S. citizen or resident alien individual. A person may establish a different status for the number by providing proof of foreign status with the Internal Revenue Service under such procedures as the Internal Revenue Service shall prescribe, including the use of a form as the Internal Revenue Service may specify. Upon accepting an individual as a nonresident alien individual, the Internal Revenue Service will assign this status to the individual’s social security number.

9. “Taxpayer” presumptions. The IRS refers to everyone as “taxpayers”, creating a false presumption on everyone’s part that we indeed are. As you will learn later in section 5.6.1, there is no statute making anyone liable for paying Subtitle A income taxes and without a liability statute, the Secretary shall have the burden of proof with respect to such issue.

Thus, the usual procedure for the recovery of debts is reversed in the field of taxation. Payment precedes defense, and the burden of proof, normally on the claimant, is shifted to the taxpayer.

The [tax] assessment supersedes the pleading, proof, and judgment necessary in an action at law, and has the force of such a judgment. The ordinary defendant stands in judgment only after a hearing. The taxpayer often is afforded his hearing after judgment and after payment, and his only redress for unjust administrative action is the right to claim restitution.10

10. Burden of proof presumptions. Later in section 5.6.15, we describe a scandal in the Internal Revenue Code, where section 7491 places the burden of proving nonliability on the “taxpayer”. Note that this section of the code never requires the government to first prove that a natural person is a “taxpayer” BEFORE the burden of proof is shifted to the taxpayer.

Here is the content of that section:

If, in any court proceeding, a taxpayer introduces credible evidence with respect to any factual issue relevant to ascertaining the liability of the taxpayer for any tax imposed by subtitle A or B, the Secretary shall have the burden of proof with respect to such issue.

11. Consent for withholding of Social Security Insurance Premiums presumption. If one is hired on to work for the government, then under 5 U.S.C. §8422, they are “deemed” to consent to the withholding of Social Security and Medicare and are never even asked whether they want to do so. Use of the word “deemed” is legalese for “presumed”. Below is the content of that section. Refer to section 5.9.7 for further details on this conspiracy against your property rights:

5 U.S.C. §8422 Deductions of OASDI for Federal Employees

---

12. Government form presumptions. Filling out of most government forms is in most cases completely voluntary and unnecessary. Whenever you submit a government form, you are “presumed” to be in pursuit of a government “privilege” and consent to be bound by all laws of the government that produced that form, even if you would not otherwise be so! For instance, if you submit an IRS form 1040, you are “presumed” to be a “taxpayer” who is “subject to” the Internal Revenue Code, even though if you had not done so, you would not be. The Department of State DS-11 form used for obtaining a U.S. passport has only one block for indicating your citizenship, which contains “U.S. citizen” and NO blocks for specifying that you are a “national”, creating a presumption that the only thing you can be in order to get a passport is a “U.S. citizen”. The IRS W-8 BEN creates a presumption that you are a “beneficial owner”, which is then defined as someone who has to include ALL income as gross income on their tax return, even though the law says this is not required. All of these are major, very serious, and FALSE presumptions that significantly prejudice and abuse your rights. The government only gets away with this type of fraud and abuse because the people filling out the forms don’t question authority or challenge the presumptions on the form. We have successfully over come most of these presumptions by modifying or redesigning the forms in original print to shift the presumption in our favor before we submit it. The modified forms then slip by inattentive and underpaid government clerks and we can then use this as evidence in our favor. Fight fire with fire!

There are many other similar “presumptions” like those above that we haven’t documented. We include these here only as examples so you can see how the scandal and violation of your rights and liberties is perpetrated by evil tyrants in our government who have transformed it into a socialist beast. Whatever the case, the Bible is very explicit about what we should do with those who act presumptuously: Rebuke and banish them from society. What does this mean in the case of juries and court trials? It means that during the voir dire process of interviewing the jurors and the judges, they must both be asked about their presumptions and biases, and those who have such biases and presumptions should be banished from the jury and the case. If the judge has a bias or presumption in favor of the government’s position, such as those listed above, then he too should be removed for conflict of interest under 28 U.S.C. §455 and bias and prejudice under 28 U.S.C. §144. Likewise, if you ever hear a government prosecutor use the phrase “everyone knows”, then a BIG red flag should go up in your mind’s eye because you are dealing with a presumption. When this happens in a courtroom, you ought to stand up and object to such nonsense immediately because your WICKED opponent is trying to frame you with presumptions and thereby violate your due process rights under the Fifth Amendment!

The reason this book is so large and extensive in its research and authorities is because we have made a disciplined effort to avoid presumptions. We have, in fact, used evidence derived from the government’s own laws, spokespersons, and courts to prove nearly every point we make in this book. This ensures that you don’t have to “assume” anything and can examine the facts and evidence for yourself and reach your own independent conclusions about the truth of what we are saying. In effect, we have pretended that we are the prosecuting attorney and you are the jury and the “court” is the “court of public opinion”. This provides excellent practice and preparation for a real trial, because we assume these materials will also be used in a real court to prosecute specific government servants for wrongdoing.

2.8.3 Illegal Acts and Legal Obfuscation

“[American tax statutes] are constantly changing as our elected representatives seek new ways to ensure that whatever tax advice we receive is incorrect.”

[Dave Barry]

Our system of government is one of delegated powers that are strictly limited under a written Constitution. The original source of all power is the people themselves, according to the Supreme Court.

“When we consider the nature and the theory of our institutions of government, the principles on which they are supposed to rest, and review the history of their development, we are constrained to conclude that they do not mean to leave room for the play and action of purely personal and arbitrary power. Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts.
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And the law is the definition and limitation of power. It is, indeed, quite true that there must always be lodged somewhere, and in some person or body, the authority of final decision; and in many cases of mere administration, the responsibility is purely political, no appeal lying except to the ultimate tribunal of the public judgment, exercised either in the pressure of opinion, or by means of the suffrage. But the fundamental rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, considered as individual possessions, are secured by those maxims of constitutional law which are the monuments showing the victorious progress of the race in securing to men the blessings of civilization under the reign of just and equal laws, so that, in the famous language of the Massachusetts bill of rights, the government of the commonwealth ‘may be a government of laws and not of men.’ For the very idea that one man may be compelled to hold his life, or the means of living, or any material right essential to the enjoyment of life, at the mere will of another, seems to be intolerable in any country where freedom prevails, as being the essence of slavery itself.”

[Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886)]

‘There is no such thing as a power of inherent sovereignty in the government of the United States...In this country sovereignty resides in the people, and Congress can exercise no power which they have not, by their Constitution entrusted to it. All else is withheld.’

[Juilliard v. Greenman, 110 U.S. 421 (1884)]

With the above in mind, any act of the federal government or its agents (including its employees, banks and employers acting under the government authority or “color” of law as indicated by a government agent) not specifically authorized by the Constitution or by the statutes which implement the Constitution is null, void, illegal, and unlawful. The definition of “illegal” in Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 747 confirms this:

“Illegal. Against or not authorized by law.”


The definition of “unlawful” on page 1536 of Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, also confirms the same conclusion:

Unlawful. That which is contrary to, prohibited, or unauthorized by law. That which is not lawful. The acting contrary to, or in defiance of the law; disobeying or disregarding the law. Term is equivalent to “without excuse or justification.” State v. Noble, 90 N.M. 360, 563 P.2d. 1153, 1157. While necessarily not implying the element of criminality, it is broad enough to include it.


Most Americans incorrectly believe that the acts of a government official are not criminal or illegal unless they VIOLATE a specific law that prohibits that behavior. We now know based on the above that this is yet another lie and myth that our government-run and deficient public education system taught us as we were growing up. In fact, any government servant who attempts an act or makes a request which the Constitution or statutes does not SPECIFICALLY AUTHORIZE in writing has committed a crime and can be fired from office for malfeasance and breaking the law if their actions injure the rights of others! This is the very essence of having a society of laws and not of men as the supreme Court mentions above!

Why don’t more government “servants” get fired for doing this? The main reason is that judges are corrupt and run a “mafia protection racket” for the wrongdoing of their coworkers in other agencies of their government employer. This is perpetuated by three different conflicts of interest in direct violation of 28 U.S.C. §455:

1. In most cases, they pay federal income taxes, and could be audited or threatened by the IRS if they rule against the IRS.
2. Their paycheck comes from income taxes, and would probably be reduced if they didn’t assist the IRS in the extortion that it imposes on the average American.
3. If they do convict or penalize their fellow federal workers, they could be removed from office by the very same legislators who approved their appointment to the bench to begin with. See section 5.3.1 of the Tax Fraud Prevention Manual, Form #06.008 for information on how judge get appointed, for instance.

In order to oppose this kind of tyranny, we must first understand how it is perpetrated. It is quite common for tyrannical public servants to try to exceed their authority by trying to:

1. Fool third parties, such as employers, into committing acts as their agents by telling them that the law says they are supposed to do things that they in fact are not obligated to do. For instance, the IRS fools private employers into using W-4 forms that technically only apply to federal employers. They also fool private banks into thinking that they must report currency transactions in excess of $3,000 when in fact only banks in federal receivership and on federal land must do so. If prosecuted for such a crime, they will try to blame the agent who was acting in their behalf in order to evade
liability. The courts encourage this kind of abuse by refusing to hold federal employees individually liable for giving false information or advice.

2. Write ambiguous statutes which the average man cannot understand without the aid of a lawyer. This makes them subjective to enforce, arbitrary, and a tool of arbitrary abuse of the populace. Ayn Rand in her book *Atlas Shrugged* provides a very good explanation of this kind of trickery:

> "Did you really think that we want those laws to be observed?" said Dr. Ferris. "We want them broken. You'd better get it straight that it's not a bunch of boy scouts you're up against - then you'll know that this is not the age for beautiful gestures. We're after power and we mean it. You fellows were pikers, but we know the real trick, and you'd better get wise to it. There's no way to rule innocent men. The only power any government has is the power to crack down on criminals. Well, when there aren't enough criminals, one makes them. One declares so many things to be a crime that it becomes impossible for men to live without breaking laws. Who wants a nation of law-abiding citizens? What's there in that for anyone? But just pass the kind of laws that can neither be observed nor enforced nor objectively interpreted - and you create a nation of law-breakers - and then you cash in on guilt. Now, that's the system, Mr. Rearden, that's the game, and once you understand it, you'll be much easier to deal with."


3. Falsely describe the ALL CIVIL statutes published by the government as “law”, even though NINE of them apply to anyone but government workers, agents, officers, or instrumentalities. See:

3.1. *Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons*, Form #05.037

[https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm](https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm)

3.2. *What is law?*, Form #05.048

[https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm](https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm)

4. Undermine the integrity of the public education system by eliminating or weakening curricula about sovereignty, citizenship, Constitutional and legal issues in the public schools so that the average American isn’t able to challenge their authority or defend himself in court without the aid of a lawyer. Eliminating prayer, God, and religious studies from schools and keeping students distracted with promiscuous sex, handing out birth control pills, and letting them get abortions without parental notification also helps kids be bad citizens that can easily be manipulated by the government because of their ignorance.

Whatever techniques our deceitful and covetous government might use to hide the truth contained in the law or to manipulate public opinion and courtroom results, those who read and know and love the law of God simply cannot be deceived. They know that:

> “One who turns his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer is an abomination.”

[Proverbs 28:9]

### 2.8.4 Propaganda and Political Warfare

> "The king establishes the land by justice, but he who receives bribes overthrows it."

[Prov. 29:4, Bible, NKJV]

Propaganda is a vehicle for deception, and political warfare is the tool used to ostracize and punish those who refuse to think and act the way the covetous government wants them to act. Under such circumstances, our government transforms itself into the thought police, and mercilessly punishes all those who dare to be “politically incorrect” using the media and other clandestine and indirect means.

Once our government obfuscates the laws to disguise their lack of jurisdiction to impose an income tax, they then must erect a propaganda machine to perpetuate the false presumption and myth that the tax code really does create this false fiction of law in the minds of average Americans. For this, they resort to the same propaganda tactics as the *communists*, and for that, they should be called communists. The end result they seek through such propaganda is the ability to act under the “color or law” to further their selfish interest without the ignorant and misinformed public knowing that they are in fact acting without lawful authority. They use the media to create an illusion that the laws say they are authorized to do that which they are doing and also confuse people about what it means to say something is “illegal” or “unlawful”, as we point out in the previous section. In order for the propaganda campaign to be successful, the following insidious elements must exist:
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1. Young minds in the schools must be inculcated to “assume” that there is a liability to pay taxes. The American Bar Association (ABA) travels around the country hand-in-hand with the IRS visiting schools to propagandize impressionable minds absent opposition like the pied piper, and handing out CD-ROMs that make it easy for high school students just starting their first job to “comply” with the tax code, which isn’t even a law. Do you think they are telling these young minds the truth that the income tax in fact isn’t even a tax, but a donation program? See section 1.11.3 for details on this scam.

2. Through decades of amendments and complicated exceptions to the tax code, and legal obfuscation, the law is then rendered so complicated and voluminous that so-called “experts” and specialized computer programs must be relied upon by the average American to understand what the law requires of them.

3. The government must then structure the professions of these “experts” to bring them under their control through licensing and regulation under the pretenses of “public protection”…what a joke! For instance, the IRS has an “Enrolled Agent Program” in which tax professionals who meet their mandatory criteria and do everything the IRS insists that they do, are given special privileges and preferential treatment. More “privilege-induced slavery and tyranny”. If you aren’t an “Enrolled agent” trying to help someone else out as a tax professional, they won’t even talk to you!

4. The government then coddles these professionals with propaganda materials such as fraudulent IRS publications, to program them into falsely believing that a liability exists. They subsidize the education of these professionals, attend their propaganda sessions, I mean conferences, and go after the dissidents who leak out the truth to keep the truth from coming out. An example of this kind of program is the IRS’ program called “Tax Talk Today”, which you can participate in at: http://www.taxtalktoday.tv/.

5. If the “experts” get out of line, the government then pulls the license of the “expert” in order to punish them for dissent. They do this to CPA’s and lawyers, for instance. In fact, they tried this tactic against a defecting IRS Criminal Investigator named Joe Banister, who left the IRS after he uncovered the fraud for himself. They tried to pull his CPA license in 2003 and 2004.

Does the above sound like liberal socialists and communists have infiltrated our educational and legal professions? That is exactly the way that it appears to us. In addition to the above techniques, more subtle and insidious methods are also used to fight the dissidents of this state-endorsed legal slavery and terrorism. These techniques collectively are called “psyops”, or “political warfare”. Our government can’t openly institute physical violence against the populace to terrorize the dissident sheep into “volunteering” for the government slavery called income tax. Therefore, greedy politicians intent on perpetuating and expanding their power will resort to the same kinds of tactics the Communists used in the former Soviet Union against their dissenters, including some combination of the following methods:

1. Media propaganda, including lies and distortions of the truth to accomplish political ends. For instance, see:


   1.2. Tax Scam Hearings held annually by the Senate Finance Committee in April: http://www.senate.gov/~finance/fin-comm.htm. In April 2002, the Senate Finance Committee hauled a chain-bound political tax prisoner in front of the camera to scare the sheep into submission.

2. Government literature and communications propaganda

   2.1. IRS publications incorrectly describe and portray the legal tax liabilities of the average American. This leads amounts to a constructive fraud. The courts then refuse to hold the government collectively responsible for the incorrect content of these publications.

   2.2. The IRS telephone support 800 number routinely gives incorrect advice about the true requirements of our tax code and creates a false presumption on the part of Americans calling in that they are “liable” for income taxes when in fact they are not. The federal courts absolutely refuse to hold individuals who render such advice liable for their fraudulent and deceptive portrayal of what the law requires.

3. Verbal abuse

   3.1. Anyone who has been late paying their taxes has seen the kinds of verbally abusive, anonymous, threatening letters and correspondence the IRS sends out.

   3.2. If you call up the IRS 800 number or visit a local IRS agent and say that you are not a “U.S. citizen”, they will frequently verbally abuse you and call you a derelict for not paying your “fair share”, even though the law defines what your fair share is and it says you owe NOTHING. When you turn it around and say that they want more than their fair share, they will hang up on you.

4. Persecution of dissenters

   4.1. Persons protesting illegal government taxes (called “Illegal Tax Protesters”) are regularly harassed, threatened, and intimidated by the DOJ and the IRS. They are frightened with frivolous charges of Willful Failure to File (26 U.S.C. §7203), Tax Evasion (26 U.S.C. §7201), and Obstruction of Justice (18 U.S.C. Chapter 73) because of their
uncooperativeness, even though the Department of Justice’s own U.S. Attorney Manual, Section 9-4.139 clearly states that no federal agency has investigative jurisdiction for these alleged crimes. The reason is clearly because 26 U.S.C. §7805 empowers the Secretary of the Treasury to write needful implementing regulations to enforce these alleged crimes but he has never done so, and without regulations applying these statutes to specific taxes and situations, these statutes are unenforceable.

4.2. Individuals who market sovereignty methods such as trusts, offshore bank accounts, etc. are routinely illegally raided by the Department of Justice with an insufficient and or nonexistent warrant for an area outside of the territorial jurisdiction of the federal government for acts that aren’t crimes, because there aren’t any implementing regulations for any of the tax crimes found in 26 U.S.C. §7201-7206. Judges hush-hush this and sanction persecuted individuals for daring to challenge the jurisdiction of the IRS or the DOJ to institute such violence against the rights of sovereign Americans.

4.3. Evidence illegally obtained during illegal raids above is then used to go on a fishing expedition to dredge up incriminating evidence or even falsify evidence, and corrupt federal judges then allow such illegally obtained or manipulated evidence to be admitted into evidence, in spite of the fact that the U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly ruled that such evidence cannot be used\(^\text{11}\). This was the tactic used against Lynne Meredith in 2002, who marketed trusts and detoxing packages. The IRS raided her premises illegally in 1999, and used the evidence illegally obtained in the raid to indict her in 2002.

5. Military intimidation

5.1. The establishment of a Department of Homeland Security and the USA Patriot Act has put the U.S. government at war with its own citizens and in conflict with the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. This Act allows the government to surreptitiously eavesdrop on the conversations and correspondence of innocent Americans without probable cause.

5.2. The money extorted from us to pay illegal income taxes funds a military machine that keeps us afraid of our own government and intent on spreading its totalitarian enslavement to the rest of the world. Is it any wonder why terrorists revolt against interference into their sovereignty by our government using the war-chest of extorted money that it stole from us?

6. Police intimidation or brutality

6.1. When IRS agents attempt to seize property or conduct a search warrant outside their territorial jurisdiction, they regularly involve local police, to add a color of authority to their illegal actions. This also allows them to claim plausible deniability and blame the local police if something goes wrong.

6.2. When 500 political protesters in Washington D.C. peacefully converged to protest a meeting of the World Bank in September 2002, they were overwhelmed by 1,700 police wielding batons, guns, rubber bullets, and teargas because they protested “illegally”. This is a clear violation of the First Amendment.

7. Outlawing gun ownership

7.1. A number of democrats have proposed outlawing or restricting gun ownership, even though the Second Amendment forbids it. They have tried to ban “assault weapons”, but if they are going to ban weapons, then they better ban government ownership of the same types of weapons in order to keep the playing field even. The reason is that Thomas Jefferson said:

> “What country can preserve its liberties if its rulers are not warned from time to time that their people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. The remedy is to set them right as to facts, pardon and pacify them.”
>

7.2. A disarmed populace is powerless to resist the abuses of armed government agents intent on illegally seizing their property in satisfaction of a fictional tax debt.

All of these tactics are used by the IRS and federal government to maintain and expand its power. Politicians know that the source of nearly ALL political power is economic, and that when you take away most of people’s money and give it to government, they can make you surrender nearly every one of your rights in order to receive the taxable government “privilege” of getting your money back!

> “To preserve [the] independence [of the people,] we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts as that we must be taxed in our meat and in our drink, in our necessaries and our comforts, in our labors and our amusements, for our callings and our creeds, as the people of England are, our people, like them, must come to labor sixteen hours in the twenty-four, give the earnings of fifteen of these to the government for their debts and daily expenses, and the sixteenth being insufficient to afford us bread, we must live, as they now do, on oatmeal

\(^\text{11}\) See Weeks v. United States, 232 U.S. 383 (1914) and section 8.4.7 later in this book.
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If you exercise your sovereignty and don’t pay the what the government falsely calls “tax” but which is actually a “donation” and protest the indebtedness our corrupt politicians have put us into, the IRS frequently persecutes you mercilessly with endless automated anonymous and threatening letters in violation of 28 U.S.C. §876, and eventually they will try to throw you in jail for not “volunteering” using laws that don’t even have any implementing regulations that are illegally enforced outside of their Constitutionally mandated territorial jurisdiction. It’s vicious, its violent, and it’s unconscionable tyranny and it must be stopped immediately because it is an act of treason and war on the American people which will eventually dissolve the country and the Union if permitted to take its course. The U.S. Supreme Court described the elements of this war in its landmark ruling of Pollock v. Farmers’ Loan and Trust, 157 U.S. 429 (1895):

“The present assault [that is WAR!!!!] upon capital is but the beginning. It will be but the stepping stone to others larger and more sweeping, until our political contest will become war of the poor against the rich; a war of growing intensity and bitterness.

... The legislation, in the discrimination it makes, is class legislation. Whenever a distinction is made in the burdens a law imposes or in the benefits it confers on any citizens by reason of their birth, or wealth, or religion, it is class legislation, and leads inevitably to oppression and abuses, and to general unrest and disturbance in society.”

The above is how our evil government runs the Socialist Security Program: like a war on the rich and the wage earners for the benefit of those too lazy to take responsibility for their own retirement. Our government becomes the Robinhood and the war is called “class warfare”, but it is nevertheless still “warfare” that is completely inappropriate in a free society. They try to get you to “volunteer” into their fraudulent system before you are even of the age to be a consenting adult by applying for a number. They have attorneys and IRS agents traveling around the country to convince adolescents that they should sign up for this slavery. Even if it was a contract at that point, the Socialist Security application isn’t enforceable because you weren’t of the age of consent, nor will they later give you an opportunity once you reach adulthood to change your mind. Then they assign you the Socialist Security Number, the Mark of the Beast (Revelation 13:16-18). Once you have the Slave Surveillance Number, the IRS calls it a “taxpayer ID number” in order to create a false presumption that you are “liable” and a “taxpayer”, which incidentally is a violation of your Due Process rights under the Fifth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Once you become a “presumed” taxpayer, they write the law so as to fool you and your propagandized attorney into believing that the burden of proof falls on you to prove that you are NOT liable. This completely turns the whole premise of our legal system upside down in this country, because we are all presumed to be innocent until proven guilty. Instead, those who volunteer (under duress, of course, because in most cases they were coerced and couldn’t get a job without doing so) are assumed to be guilty until THEY prove themselves innocent. That’s like telling someone they are a convicted prostitute (government whore) unless they prove that they aren’t. It’s downright EVIL!

After you sign up for this Slave Surveillance Number (SSN), the government first steals your money and makes it effectively illegal to stop contributing, thus outlawing personal responsibility and one’s ownership over one’s labor and person. They will try to slap illegal fines and penalties on you for telling the truth on your tax return that you have no taxable income, for instance, in violation of Article 1, Section 9, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution. If you even THINK about dis-enrolling, they will get all over your employer’s payroll department and slander you in front of your boss, at the same time being unwilling to cite their legal authority for doing so, which by the way doesn’t exist. Then they use the leverage gained by stealing your money to place all kinds of conditions on getting your own money back. For instance, if you are sentenced to jail for crimes, the federal government unilaterally terminates your socialist benefits and forces you in effect to subsidize your own incarceration with the social security checks they intercept! That’s like what they forced Jesus to do: Manufacture his own cross and then nail Him to it! When you realize how manipulative their system is and want to quit, the totalitarian Social Security Administration (SSA) provides no lawful way to quit the program, have your money refunded, and rescind your Slave Surveillance Number, and yet they lie by saying that the program is “voluntary”. That is constructive fraud because your compliance isn’t voluntary, but compelled, plain and simple. Nothing can be voluntary if there is no legal way to quit, even though no government person can ever show you any kind of contract you ever signed that said that joining was irrevocable. That’s tyranny, totalitarianism, and communism, plain and simple.

The common denominator of all of the political warfare and “psyops” (psychological operations) tactics described above is that all of these techniques involve some combination of force or fraud, both of which constitute treason against the
Constitutional rights of Americans. Here is how one respected member of the academic community described the terms of this warfare against the American people:

"Warfare is often defined as the employment of military means to advance political ends... Another, more subtle means -- political warfare -- uses images, ideas, speeches, slogans, propaganda, economic pressures, even advertising techniques to influence the political will of an adversary."

[James A. Baldwin, Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy in forward to On Political War by Paul A. Smith, National Defense University (1990)]

If you would like to learn more about the verbal abuse tactics that are at the heart of the government’s political war against its citizens, we refer you to our Family Constitution, section 3.10 at:

http://famguardian.org/Publications/FamilyConst/FamilyConst.htm

If you would like to learn more about communism and socialism and their downright evil “psyops” tactics, visit our Communism and Socialism page at:

http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Communism/Communism.htm

And finally, if you would like some extensive examples of how this political war is played, we refer you to the content of the following:

Tax Fraud Prevention Manual, Form #06.008, Chapter 2

2.8.5 Willful Ignorance of Public Servants

We covered the topic of ignorance earlier in section 1.8 in the context of our own ignorance as Americans. The same concepts discussed there generally apply toward the government, as well. The differences between our ignorance and that of government servants are distinguished below:

1. When we are ignorant, the result will be intellectual and financial slavery to the government and the legal profession.
2. When government servants at the bottom of the food chain are ignorant, they are susceptible to being fooled into breaking the laws by greedy and covetous supervisors above them. The result is tyranny on the part of the government, because the government then erroneously acts as through it has far more authority and power than it lawfully has.

Several IRS agents we spoke with indicated that they are trained on procedures but not law. This, in spite of the fact that the government’s own courts say the following about our responsibility to know the law:

"Every citizen of the United States is supposed to know the law,..."

[Pierce v. United States, 7 Wall (74 U.S. 169) 666 (1869)]

As long as the procedures of the IRS (found in the Internal Revenue Manual, for instance) illegally perpetuate and expand the power of the IRS and so long as the federal and state courts continue to refuse to hold the supervisors who write these procedures liable and accountable for their breach of fiduciary duty and resulting injury to our rights that bad procedures can produce, then widespread evil, injustice, and violation of due process on the part of government will continue to expand. In such an environment, there will be a built-in incentive for high-level managers at the IRS to:

1. Write internal rules and procedures (Internal Revenue Manual) that violate the law and maximize their revenues, their perceived authority, and their damage to our constitutional rights.
2. Hire people who are ignorant of the laws to administer particularly unethical and illegal areas of government administration, such as income tax collection and assessment.
3. Not train IRS agents on the law but only on procedures so they remain ignorant of the illegal nature of what they are being asked to do.
4. When the deliberately dumbed-down IRS agent finally discovers through his own research and talking with “taxpayers” that what he is being asked to do in the written procedures is illegal, then he is asked to resign and the procedures are never corrected. This is a clear effort to obstruct justice and cover-up wrongdoing. He is treated as a whistleblower and
punished and slandered. This is what happened to Joe Banister, the X IRS Criminal Investigator who discovered after working for the IRS for four years that the IRS was actually committing fraud and extortion and he was asked to resign (see http://www.freedomabovefortune.com/).

5. Not update their training materials to accurately and completely reflect the very limited lawful jurisdiction and authority of the government to collect and assess income taxes.

6. Slander, persecute, and harass “taxpayers” who bring up the truth about their limited liabilities using anonymous threatening letters, unjustified and illegal penalties and interest, and threatened civil litigation and criminal prosecution.

7. Claim ignorance of the law when prosecution for wrongdoing is attempted on both government supervisors and their subordinates.

Incidentally, when government is attempting to prosecute a person for tax evasion and the person manifests complete and deliberate ignorance of the tax code or any violations of it, this situation is known as “willful blindness”, and it’s existence can be used as a fact to be proved by the jury in the process of satisfying the elements of a claim of “willfulness” in the context of tax evasion or fraud. We think the same concept should apply toward government servants who are grossly negligent and deliberately ignorant about and evasive of the tax code. See the at the following for a definition of “willful blindness”:

**Department of Justice, Tax Division, Criminal Tax Manual, Section 8.06[4]**


Below is what the Criminal Tax Manual says on the subject of “willful blindness” in the above referenced section:


It is a defense to a finding of willfulness that the defendant was ignorant of the law or of facts which made the conduct illegal, since willfulness requires a voluntary and intentional violation of a known legal duty. However, if the defendant deliberately avoided acquiring knowledge of a fact or the law, then the jury may infer that he actually knew it and that he was merely trying to avoid giving the appearance (and incurring the consequences) of knowledge. See United States v. Ramsey, 785 F.2d. 184, 189 (7th Cir.), cert. denied sub nom. McCrea v. United States, 476 U.S. 1186 (1986).

In such a case, the use of an "ostrich instruction" -- also known as a deliberate ignorance, conscious avoidance, willful blindness, or a Jewell instruction (see United States v. Jewell, 532 F.2d. 697 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 426 U.S. 951 (1976) -- may be appropriate.

A number of courts have approved the use of such instructions under proper circumstances. See, e.g., United States v. Picciandra, 788 F.2d. 39, 46 (1st Cir.), cert. denied, 479 U.S. 847 (1986); United States v. MacKenzie, 777 F.2d. 811, 818-19 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 476 U.S. 1169 (1986); United States v. Callahan, 588 F.2d. 1078 (5th Cir. 1979); United States v. Dude, 820 F.2d. 886, 892 (7th Cir. 1987); United States v. Bussey, 942 F.2d. 1241, 1246 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 112 S.Ct. 1936 (1991) (post-Cheek decision); United States v. Fingado, 934 F.2d. 1163, 1166-1167 (10th Cir.), cert. denied, 112 S.Ct. 320 (1991). However, it has also been said that the use of such instructions is "rarely appropriate." United States v. deFrancisco-Lopez, 939 F.2d. 1405, 1409 (10th Cir. 1991) (relying on several 9th Circuit cases). Thus, it is advisable not to request such an instruction unless it is clearly warranted by the evidence in a particular case. Furthermore, the language of any deliberate ignorance instruction in a criminal tax case must comport with the Government's obligation to prove the voluntary, intentional violation of a known legal duty. The deliberate ignorance instruction set forth in United States v. Fingado, 934 F.2d. at 1166, appears to be suitable for a criminal tax case. Further, to avoid potential confusion with the meaning of “willfulness” as it relates to the defendant's intent, it may be wise to avoid use of the phrase “willful blindness,” using instead such phrases as “deliberate ignorance” or “conscious avoidance.”

[United States Department of Justice, Criminal Tax Manual, Section 8.04[4]]

How do the federal courts view this despicable “willful ignorance” and the misapplication of the law by federal employees who practice it? Here is what one judge said about private individuals who practiced the same despicable behavior. You be the judge!:

“Additionally, honesty is inconsistent with willful ignorance of the facts and circumstances available to the creditor, and thus the facts and circumstances that reasonable investigation would have disclosed may be relevant. While ‘honesty’ may require no more than a pure heart, it is questionable that a pure heart can co-exist with closed eyes. It is not honest to close one’s eyes so as to maintain an empty head.”

[Hale Contracting v. United New Mexico Bank, 799 P.2d. 581 (1990)]

Another way to describe government employees who practice “willful ignorance” is to say that they are operating in “bad faith”, as opposed to “good faith”.

The Great IRS Hoax: Why We Don't Owe Income Tax, version 4.54

TOP SECRET: For Official Treasury/IRS Use Only (FOUO) Copyright Family Guardian Fellowship http://famguardian.org/
2.8.6 Compelled Income Taxes on Labor (slavery)

"Taxation of earnings from labor is on a par with forced labor. Seizing the results of someone's labor is equivalent to seizing hours from him and directing him to carry on various activities."
[Robert Nozick, Harvard philosopher]

"The essential element in war is not killing per se, but rather the compelling of an opponent to do one's will... The essence is a contest of political will, whose means may involve varying forms and degrees of compulsion."
[Paul A. Smith, Jr., On Political War, National Defense University Press]

Notice we didn’t say “taxes”, but rather “income taxes” based on wage? We’re not objecting to “taxes”, but to involuntary or compelled payment to the government based on earnings from labor. Taxes in proportion to one’s earnings for labor, as you will find out later, amount to slavery. If one’s income tax bracket is 28%, then they are a slave to the government for the first 28% of the year. There is no other way to look at it. But wait a minute, you say, the Thirteenth amendment and the civil war ended slavery, right? Economic slavery is still slavery, no matter how you want to look at it! That’s why the Constitution forbids direct taxes by the federal government on natural persons (people like you and I). because our founding fathers wisely understood this relationship between income from labor and direct taxes on that income by the government.

Interestingly, if you look up the word slave in the dictionary, you will find out that the word refers to a person who has no property rights. Labor has intrinsic value because you can exchange it for money. Even the U.S. Supreme Court agrees that labor is property. However, the exchange of labor for money doesn’t involve profit in the taxable sense, because it is an equal exchange, especially when you consider the cost of producing the labor, such as food, rent, education, etc. Therefore, any attempt by the government to tax income from the equal exchange of one type of property for another amounts to tyranny and slavery. This was made very clear by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of Butchers’ Union Co. v. Crescent City Co., 111 U.S. 746 (1884)

"Among these unalienable rights, as proclaimed in that great document [the Declaration of Independence] is the right of men to pursue their happiness, by which is meant, the right any lawful business or vocation, in any manner not inconsistent with the equal rights of others, which may increase their prosperity or develop their faculties, so as to give them their highest enjoyment...It has been well said that, THE PROPERTY WHICH EVERY MAN HAS IN HIS OWN LABOR, AS IT IS THE ORIGINAL FOUNDATION OF ALL OTHER PROPERTY SO IT IS THE MOST SACRED AND INVIOLABLE..."
[Butchers’ Union Co. v. Crescent City Co., 111 U.S. 746 (1884)]

2.8.7 The Socialist (Social) Security Number: Mark of the Beast

"And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads:

And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.

Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six."
[Revelation 13:16-18, the Bible]

The Socialist Security Number in today’s society has become a very powerful tool for restraint of individual liberties and for tracking people down mercilessly like hunted animals and then controlling and abusing them. The Bible calls this mark the “Mark of the Beast”, as shown above in Rev. 13:16-18. The Bible even identifies who the “beast” is!

"And I saw the beast, the kings [political rulers] of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war against Him [Jesus] who sat on the horse and against His army."
[Revelation 19:19, Bible, NKJV]

The beast therefore consists of corrupt totalitarian governments, their armies, and the politicians who run them who are against God and His Law. The Socialist Security Number has basically become the chief tool of organized extortion by these Satanic government “beasts”. It is a key tool used by law enforcement, for instance, for locating individuals who are wanted. Given a person’s social security number, you can, for a fee, use national databases to determine the following information about a person without their consent:

1. Credit cards and loans.
2. Credit history.
Chapter 2: U.S. Government Background

3. Income tax returns filed.
4. Government benefits received, including social security and Medicare benefits.
5. Vehicles that have loans on them.
6. Real property that has loans on it.
7. Bank accounts.
8. Safe deposit boxes.
9. Driver's licenses and current address using driver's license number.

This information is most useful to the IRS in tracking tax protesters down and destroying their lives by confiscating and levying their assets, even if they owe no taxes, without a trial or due process of law. The only way for a person to protect his or her privacy from such abuse is to ensure that they never apply for or use a social security number, do not provide it when asked for it, and remove themselves from the Social Security System immediately so they can get rid of the "mark of the beast". One has to wonder, doesn’t the 4th Amendment protect our privacy? How is it that a bank can legally refuse serving us and force us to give up our privacy and get a number on our forehead just to be able to have a bank account?

For detailed information on Socialist Security Numbers, refer to the website: http://www.nossn.com/. This site is very interesting. Also, if you want to free yourself of the coercion you feel about having to participate in social security, refer to:

Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

2.8.7.1 Coercion: The Enumeration At Birth Program

Under the Enumeration at Birth Program, the U.S. government has instituted a means to in effect "bar code" babies (mark of the beast, Rev. 13:16-18) when they are born right there at the hospital so they can get into the tax system immediately and be tracked by government computers as "wards of the state".

The Social Security Administration will always tell you that getting an SSN is strictly voluntary. The following page on their website even states that you don’t have to get one for your children:

http://www.ssa.gov/pubs/10023.html

They will also tell you that no one is required to get a SSN to live and work in the United States. The law will confirm this. The only people required to get a SSN is aliens upon admission into the United States and "All other Applicants". What they will not do is tell you that they are going to do everything in their power to make sure that everyone is enumerated. For example, here is the procedure if a parent objects to a newborn getting a SSN under the "Enumeration at Birth Program."

Notice how they will pretend that the state inadvertently keyed "yes." And this is what our hospitals are instructed to do! You can’t even have a baby without the state trying to assign a Socialist Security Number! Of course, you have the right to object as a parent to assigning an SSN, but the fact is that they already have a number and a card assigned before they ask you if you want one and make it inconvenient to say no.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER POLICY AND GENERAL PROCEDURES

---------------------------------------------------------------------
TN 16 6-90 RM 00905.100B.

---------------------------------------------------------------------

00205.100 PARENT OBJECTS TO ASSIGNMENT OF SSN TO CHILD UNDER THE ENUMERATION AT BIRTH PROGRAM

A. POLICY SSA does not change, void or cancel SSNs. In special situations, SSA will delete the applicant information from the SSN record.

B. PROCEDURE A parent may object when a child is assigned an SSN.
If a child is issued an SSN card via the Enumeration at Birth program (the online NUMIDENT shows "FMC:6" for Enumeration at Birth items) and the mother states she answered "no" to the enumeration question when providing birth information for the newborn, assume that the State inadvertently keyed "yes", and follow these steps:

STEP ACTION

1 Explain that the child will need an SSN, by at least age 2, if he/she will be listed as a dependent on an income tax return.

* If the parent accepts this explanation and will keep the SSN card, stop.

* If this is not acceptable, go to step 2.

2 Explain that on SSA's records, the account will remain dormant, unless earnings are posted on the record.

* If the parent accepts this explanation and will keep the card, stop.

* If the parent accepts the explanation but does want the SSN card, take the card and destroy the card (RM 00201.060). Explain that when an application is later made for an SSN card the same number will be assigned.

* If the parent insists that we delete the SSN record, explain that the deletion action may take several months. (Go to step 3.)

3 * Document the parent's objection and advise the parent that the case must be sent to central office (CO) for review.

* Explain to the parent that if we delete the applicant information from the SSN record, a subsequent SSN request (likely before the child is age 2) will result in a different SSN. In addition, if and when the parent files for an SSN for the child in the future, he/she should enter "no" in item 10 on the SS-5.

* Forward all material pertinent to the situation (including the FO observation and recommendation) to CO at:

Social Security Administration
ORSI, DE, E&R
3-E-26 Operations Building
6401 Security Blvd.
Baltimore, MD 21235

4 Request review of the case and action concerning the parent's request for deletion of the data from the
SSN record. Send a copy of the entire file to the
appropriate regional office so that they can discuss
ongoing problems with the involved State.

The above page was reprinted (without permission) from the SSA website. Of course this will confirm that it is voluntary. It
certainly doesn’t seem that way. I have talked to many parents who were told that they could not leave the hospital without
getting a SSN for their newborn. Do I detect shades of Nazi Germany here somewhere?

2.8.7.2 Coercion: Denying Benefits for Those who Refuse to Provide Socialist Security Numbers

While there are no laws forcing citizens to obtain or use their Socialist Security Number, for all practical purposes, its use
has become mandatory. Consider the following scenarios that mitigate against functioning in our culture without a social
security number:

1. You cannot obtain a loan or a credit card or open a bank or checking account at the vast majority of U.S. Banks, without
a Socialist Security Number, even if your credit expenditures are guaranteed by collateral deposits. If you ask the banks
why, they will say: “Well, the only way we can get information about your credit history is with your social security
number. Furthermore, we’re not denying you a privilege like loans, because you can always go to another bank.” That’s
just a smokescreen, of course, because if you ask them who grants credit or bank accounts without a social security
number, they will know of no one to refer you to, because there aren’t any banks in the U.S. that would. This amounts
to legalized discrimination that ought to be punished by court sanctions.

2. There are no banks that will allow you to have a safe deposit box without a social security number.

3. You can’t claim your children as tax deductions on your federal income tax returns without providing their social security
number. Of course, no one at the IRS advertises that you don’t need the social security and can substitute an affidavit
and a copy of the birth certificate, because they don’t want you knowing that you don’t need a socialist security number
for your child.

4. Some employers will say they can’t hire you unless they have a social security number, even though they are mistaken
and the law says they can’t do this.

5. In some states now, you cannot get a driver’s license without a social security number. The justification the courts and
states use is that they need to be able to do this so that “deadbeat dads” will lose their driver’s license if they don’t pay
child support, but the fact of the matter is that they insist on your socialist security number even if you aren’t a parent
and don’t plan on being one. That is because this gives them one more way to find you and one less way you can hide.

6. You cannot get a mailbox without at least two forms of identification AND a home address where you live, as per Postal
Service Form 1583. Acceptable forms of identification include government civilian or military ID cards, which have
your social security number on them. Furthermore, a copy of the holder’s identifying information must be provided to
the postal service on a copy of the application.

7. You cannot get student loans without a social security number.

8. You can’t apply for AFDC, Medicaid, unemployment compensation, food stamps, or state programs without a socialist
security number.

9. You can’t be an officer of a food retail store that accepts food stamps without having a social security number.

10. You can’t serve on a jury without someone asking you for your SSN.

11. You can’t apply for a HUD program without providing your SSN.

However, the law says you can’t be discriminated against for failure to provide or use a Social Security Number. Public Law
94-455 at section 1211 “Use of Social Security Numbers?” states:

Under the Privacy Act of 1974, it is unlawful for a Federal, State, or local government agency to deny to any
individual any right, benefit, or privilege provided by law because of the individual’s refusal to disclose his social
security account number...”.

[Public Law 94-455, Section 1211]

So how can one survive without social security numbers? Here are some ideas:

1. Use cash or gold for all financial transactions.
2. Refuse to divulge your social security number to anyone.
3. Have offshore bank accounts and credit cards from banks that do not require social security numbers and which will
respect your privacy and not divulge your transactions to the IRS.
4. When claiming your children as tax deductions, do not obtain or use their social security number on your income tax return, if you submit one of course. Instead, submit a copy of the birth certificate for each child along with an affidavit claiming you are the parent of that child.

5. Do not provide your social security number on your income tax returns. Also, do not provide your direct home address on your income tax returns in order to preserve your privacy. Give your overseas mail forwarder address instead.

6. Do not file a W-4 to institute withholding at your employer. Filing of this form is voluntary. If you do file the form or are forced to, refuse to provide your social security number.

7. Obtain an overseas driver’s license so you don’t need a local one that requires divulging your social security number.

8. Avoid putting anything in a local bank account or safe deposit box, and if you do, assume it will be confiscated by the government or the I.R.S. illegally.

9. Use offshore postal forwarders, who will respect your privacy and forward your mail confidentially to your local address.

10. Prosecute employers vigorously who discriminate against employees who do not have or will not provide their social security number. This behavior is clearly illegal.

2.8.8 National ID Cards

National ID cards would accomplish the same function as Socialist Security Numbers, and in most cases, would just be a vehicle to automate the computerized tracking of individuals and expand the Mark of the Beast to new areas of people’s lives heretofore not seen. National ID cards extend the tracking of individuals and further invade privacy, because they can be used to store information about individuals. National ID cards should therefore be avoided by all for the same reason that Socialist Security Numbers should be avoided.

2.8.9 Paper Money

“We make money the old fashioned way. We print it.”

[Art Rolnick, former Chief Economist, Minneapolis Federal Reserve Bank]

“The abandonment of the gold standard made it possible for the welfare-statists (government bureaucrats) to use the banking system as an unlimited expansion of credit. In the absence of the gold standard, there is no way to protect savings from confiscation through inflation... Deficit spending is simply a scheme for the "hidden" confiscation of wealth. Gold stands in the way of this insidious process.”

[Alan Greenspan]

Here’s an interesting and funny comment that one of our readers said about tax protesters as it relates to the money issue:

Are you aware that government needs tax protesters?

To protest taxes maintains the fiction that IRS collects [lawful] money and that government spends [lawful] money. IRS does not ask for money, they ask for checks or money orders. WHY?

They know that we have no [lawful] money. If you owed them one thousand dollars and appeared at their office with 1000 dollars of silver, they would not know what to do with the coins and I understand that they can not take Fed notes!

I offer by newspapers and internet, 100 pounds of money to each person who just describes the money that government spends and I get no takers! Care to try?

Do you know the purpose of the Imaginary Revenue Scum (IRS)?

[Winston Smith]

Hilarious! This simply reinforces the idea that we aren’t really using lawful money, as the Constitution, Article I, section 10 reads says:

“No state shall...coin money, emit bills of credit, make any thing but gold and silver a tender in payment of debts...”

The money you use is fiat money and is unconstitutional! You are using monopoly money that isn’t worth anything.

2.8.9.1 What is Money?
The most powerful and enlightening discussion of money we have ever seen comes from a book by Ayn Rand entitled *Atlas Shrugged*. This book is highly recommended for freedom fighters and we guarantee it will change your view of the world forever. The theme of the book is laissez faire capitalism v. socialism and it does a very good job comparing the two in a practical sense by showing why capitalism is the only one of the two that is compatible with having a free country. It is a fiction book but it has a powerful non-fiction message we are sure you will enjoy. Below is an excerpt from that marvelous book on page 387 of the 35th Anniversary Edition.

Rearden heard Bertram Scudder, outside the group, say to a girl who made some sound of indignation, "Don't let him disturb you. You know, money is the root of all evil--and he's the typical product of money."

Rearden did not think that Francisco could have heard it, but he saw Francisco turning to them with a gravely courteous smile.

"So you think that money is the root of all evil?" said Francisco d'Aconia. "Have you ever asked what is the root of money? Money is a tool of exchange, which can't exist unless there are goods produced and men able to produce them. Money is the material shape of the principle that men who wish to deal with one another must deal by trade and give value for value. Money is not the tool of the moochers [the politicians and demagogues], who claim your product by tears, or of the looters [the IRS], who take it from you by force. Money is made possible only by the men who produce [not STEAL]. Is this what you consider evil?

"When you accept money in payment for your effort, you do so only on the conviction that you will exchange it for the product of the effort of others. It is not the moochers or the looters who give value to money. Not an ocean of tears nor all the guns in the world can transform those pieces of paper in your wallet into the bread you will need to survive tomorrow. Those pieces of paper, which should have been gold, are a token of honor - your claim upon the energy of the men who produce. Your wallet is your statement of hope that somewhere in the world around you there are men who will not default on that moral principle which is the root of money. Is this what you consider evil?

"Have you ever looked for the root of production? Take a look at an electric generator and dare tell yourself that it was created by the muscular effort of unthinking brutes. Try to grow a seed of wheat without the knowledge left to you by men who had to discover it for the first time. Try to obtain your food by means of nothing but physical motions--and you'll learn that man's mind is the root of all the goods produced and of all the wealth that has ever existed on earth.

"But you say that money is made by the strong at the expense of the weak? What strength do you mean? It is not the strength of guns or muscles. Wealth is the product of man's capacity to think. Then is money made by the man who invents a motor at the expense of the others who did not invent it? Is money made by the intelligent at the expense of the fools? By the able at the expense of the incompetent? By the ambitious at the expense of the lazy?

Money is MADE--before it can be looted or mooched--made by the effort of every honest man, each to the extent of his ability. An honest man is one who knows that he can't consume more than he has produced [like the government has been doing for decades with inflation and deficit spending].

"To trade by means of money is the code of the men of good will. Money rests on the axiom that every man is the owner of his mind and his effort. Money allows no power to prescribe the value of your effort except by the voluntary choice of the man who is willing to trade you his effort in return. Money permits you to obtain for your goods and your labor that which they are worth to the men who buy them, but no more. Money permits no deals except those to mutual benefit by the unforced judgment of the traders. Money demands of you the recognition that men must work for their own benefit, not for their own injury, for their gain, not their loss--the recognition that they are not beasts of burden, born to carry the weight of your misery--that you must offer them values, not wounds--that the common bond among men is not the exchange of suffering, but the exchange of GOODS. Money demands that you sell, not your weakness to men's stupidity, but your talent to their reason; it demands that you buy, not the shoddilest they offer, but the best your money can find. And when men live by trade--with reason, not force, as their final arbiter--it is the best product that wins, the best performance, the man of best judgment and highest ability--and the degree of a man's productiveness is the degree of his reward. This is the code of existence whose tool and symbol is money. Is this what you consider evil?

"But money is only a tool. It will take you wherever you wish, but it will not replace you as the driver. It will give you the means for the satisfaction of your desires, but it will not provide you with desires. Money is the scourge of the men who attempt to reverse the law of causality--the men who seek to replace the mind by seizing the products of the mind.

"Money will not purchase happiness for the man who has no concept of what he wants; money will not give him a code of values, if he's evaded the knowledge of what to value, and it will not provide him with a purpose, if he's evaded the choice of what to seek. Money will not buy intelligence for the fool, or admiration for the coward, or respect for the incompetent. The man who attempts to purchase the brains of his superiors to serve him, with his money replacing his judgment, ends up by becoming the victim of his inferiors. The men of
intelligence desert him, but the cheats and the frauds come flocking to him, drawn by a law which he has not
discovered: that no man may be smaller than his money. Is this the reason why you call it evil?

“Only the man who does not need it, is fit to inherit wealth--the man who would make his own fortune no
matter where he started. If an heir is equal to his money, it serves him; if not, it destroys him. But you look on
and you cry that money corrupted him. Did it? Or did he corrupt his money? Do not envy a worthless heir; his
wealth is not yours and you would have done no better with it. Do not think that it should have been distributed
among you; loading the world with fifty parasites instead of one, would not bring back the dead virtue which
was the fortune. Money is a living power that dies without its root. Money will not serve that mind that cannot
match it. Is this the reason why you call it evil?

“Money is your means of survival. The verdict which you pronounce upon the source of your livelihood is the
verdict you pronounce upon your life. If the source is corrupt, you have damned your own existence. Did you
get your money by fraud? By pandering to men's vices or men's stupidity? By catering to fools, in the hope of
getting more than your ability deserves? By lowering your standards? By doing work you despise for
purchasers you scorn? If so, then your money will not give you a moment's or a penny's worth of joy. Then all
the things you buy will become, not a tribute to you, but a reproach; not an achievement, but a reminder of
shame. Then you'll scream that money is evil. Evil, because it would not pinch-hit for your self-respect? Evil,
because it would not let you enjoy your depravity? Is this the root of your hatred of money?

“Money will always remain an effect and refuse to replace you as the cause. Money is the product of virtue,
but it will not give you virtue and it will not redeem your vices. Money will not give you the unearned, neither
in matter nor in spirit. Is this the root of your hatred of money?

“Or did you say it's the LOVE of money that's the root of all evil? To love a thing is to know and love its nature.
To love money is to know and love the fact that money is the creation of the best power within you, and your
passkey to trade your effort for happiness. Do you wish to know whether that day is coming?

“Let me give you a tip on a clue to men's characters: the man who demands money has obtained it dishonorably;
the man who respects it has earned it.

“Run for your life from any man who tells you that money is evil. That sentence is the leper's bell of an
approaching looter. So long as men live together on earth and need means to deal with one another--their only
substitute, if they abandon money, is the muzzle of a gun.

“But money demands of you the highest virtues, if you wish to make it or to keep it. Men who have no courage,
pride, or self-esteem, men who have no moral sense of their right to their money and are not willing to defend
it as they defend their life, men who apologize for being rich--will not remain rich for long. They are the
natural bait for the swarms of looters that stay under rocks for centuries, but come crawling out at the first
smell of a man who begs to be forgiven for the guilt of owning wealth. They will hasten to relieve him of the
guilt--and of his life, as he deserves.

“Then you will see the rise of the double standard--the men who live by force [the government and the IRS and
scumbag lawyers], yet count on those who live by trade to create the value of their looted money--the men who are
the hucksters of virtue. In a moral society, there are the criminals, and the statutes are written to protect
you against them. But when a society establishes criminals-by-right and looters-by-law--men who use force to
seize the wealth of DISARMED victims--then money becomes its creators' avenger. Such looters [IRS] believe
it safe to rob defenseless [made ignorant of the law by sneaky lawyers and politicians who run the public
education system, in this case] men, once they've passed a law to disarm them. But their loot becomes the
magnet for other looters, who get it from them as they got it. Then the race goes, not to the ablest at production,
but to those most ruthless at brutality. When force is the standard, the murderer wins over the pickpocket. And
then that society vanishes, in a spread of ruins and slaughter.

“Do you wish to know whether that day is coming? Watch money. Money is the barometer of a society's virtue.
When you see that trading is done, not by consent, but by compulsion--when you see that in order to produce,
you need to obtain permission from men who produce nothing--when you see that money is flowing to those
who deal, not in goods, but in favors--when you see that men get richer by graft and by pull than by work, and
your laws don't protect you against them, but protect them against you--when you see corruption being
rewarded and honesty becoming a self-sacrifice--you may know that your society is doomed. Money is so noble
a medium that it does not compete with guns and it does not make terms with brutality. It will not permit a
country to survive as half-propert, half-foot.

“Whenever destroyers [the IRS, the Federal Reserve, and the Dept of Justice] appear among men, they start
by destroying money, for money is men's protection and the base of a moral existence. Destroyers seize gold
and leave to its owners a counterfeit pile of paper. This kills all objective standards and delivers men into the
arbitrary power of an arbitrary setter of values. Gold was an objective value, an equivalent of wealth produced.

Paper is a mortgage on wealth that does not exist, backed by a gun aimed at those who are expected to produce
it. Paper is a check drawn by legal looters upon an account which is not theirs: upon the virtue of the victims. Watch for the day when it becomes, marked: 'Account overdrawn.'

“When you have made evil [government looting through fraud, obfuscation and complication of the tax laws, and through vote for sugar-daddies who promise loot] the means of survival, do not expect men to remain good. Do not expect them to stay moral and lose their lives for the purpose of becoming the fodder of the immoral. Do not expect them to produce, when production is punished and looting rewarded. Do not ask, ‘Who is destroying the world?’ You are.

“You stand in the midst of the greatest achievements of the greatest productive civilization and you wonder why it’s crumbling around you, while you’re damning its life-blood-money. You look upon money as the savages did before you, and you wonder why the jungle is creeping back to the edge of your cities. Throughout men’s history, money was always seized by looters of one brand or another, but whose method remained the same: to seize wealth by force and to keep the producers bound, demeaned, defamed, deprived of honor. That phrase about the evil of money, which you mouth with such righteous recklessness, comes from a time when wealth was produced by the labor of slaves—slaves who repeated the motions once discovered by somebody’s mind and left unimproved for centuries. So long as production was ruled by force, and wealth was obtained by conquest, there was little to conquer. Yet through all the centuries of stagnation and starvation, men exalted the looters, as aristocrats of the sword, as aristocrats of birth, as aristocrats of the bureau, and despised the producers, as slaves, as traders, as shopkeepers—as industrialists.

'To the glory of mankind, there was, for the first and only time in history, a COUNTRY OF MONEY—and I have no higher, more reverent tribute to pay to America, for this means: a country of reason, justice, freedom, production, achievement. For the first time, man’s mind and money were set free, and there were no fortunes-by-conquest, but only fortunes-by-work, and instead of swordsmen and slaves, there appeared the real maker of wealth, the greatest worker, the highest type of human being—the self-made man—the American industrialist.

'If you ask me to name the proudest distinction of Americans, I would choose—because it contains all the others—the fact that they were the people who created the phrase ‘to MAKE money.’ No other language or nation had ever used these words before; men had always thought of wealth as a static quantity—to be seized, begged, inherited, shared, looted, or obtained as a favor. Americans were the first to understand that wealth has to be created. The words ‘to make money’ hold the essence of human morality.

'Yet these were the words for which Americans were denounced by the rotted cultures of the looters’ continents. Now the looters’ credo has brought you to the point where you regard your proudest [capitalist] achievements as a hallmark of shame, your prosperity as guilt, your greatest men, the industrialists, as blackguards, and your magnificent factories as the product and property of muscular labor, the labor of whip-driven slaves, like the pyramids of Egypt. The rotter [the IRS and the federal and state governments] who simpers that he sees no difference between the power of the dollar and the power of the whip, ought to learn the difference on his own hide-as, I think, he will.

'Until and unless you discover that money is the root of all good, you ask for your own destruction. When money ceases to be the tool by which men deal with one another, then men become the tools of men. Blood, whips and guns—or dollars. Take your choice—there is no other—and your time is running out.’

Powerful stuff, folks! If you would like more information about Ayn Rand’s book above, please refer to our website at:

Who is John Galt, Family Guardian Fellowship

2.8.9.2 ‘Separation of Money and State’

A very popular term in our age of political correctness is the term “separation of church and state”. This term was first coined by Thomas Jefferson in a letter to the Danbury Baptist Church on October 7, 1801 and has been cited in several subsequent rulings by the Supreme Court which removed prayer from the schools and from other aspects of public life. However, how many people know that in addition to “separation of church and state”, our founders also sought “separation of money and state”? Very few people understand this concept and why it is so important, so we will devote this section to this fascinating concept.

The original purposes of currency were simple, but complete insofar as serving the purposes of involved parties. The original forms of currency arose spontaneously in accord with the desired structure of trade. In such an original form, the money, if any, was a token of value. No party which contributed nothing to the trade, profited from it.
Ultimately, governments would come to regulate monetary circulations. In very many cases, because the power to issue currencies is the opportunity to take tremendous unearned profit from entire nations, the advantages of a circulation which could be honored by — and which could fully serve — a broad trade system, were subverted and abused.

The colonies of the United States of America were unique among the nations and nations-to-be of the world, as they modeled their currency to replicate solely, trade between consenting parties, that no party extrinsic to the trade profited unjustly from it. This is what we call "separation of money and state": a situation where even though the government created the money, they could not manipulate its value to their advantage because they could not arbitrarily create more money with a printing press. If they could arbitrarily print more money, then they would lower the value of the money in circulation and thereby "tax" all the money in existence.

The virtues of the near perfect American Colonial system therefore comprised the greatest possible threat to systems of multiplying indebtedness, because the very complete freedom to prosper without impediment, inherent solely to the perfected attributes exemplified by the American Colonial system, vibrantly demonstrated the iniquities of unjust profit rendered by the multiplication of debt inherent to, and irreversible within, central banking systems.

The money of the American Colonies thus became the principal cause of the American Revolution.

On behalf of the Bank of England, British Parliament ordered the colonists to give up their interest-free currency. No such system as the colonists had devised could be allowed to demonstrate the impoverishing costs imposed by the plutocrats, of a currency subject to multiplied, unearned profit. By dictate of the plutocracy of England, in America, as everywhere else in the world, debt would be perpetually and irreversibly multiplied upon the un-asserting subjects of the system, to their ever greater detriment.

The colonists would pay some thirty-percent annual interest for the imposed currency. Benjamin Franklin reported, "Within a year, the poor houses were filled. The hungry and homeless walked the streets everywhere." He later explained, "We would have gladly borne the little tax on tea and other matters, if it had not been that they took from us our money, which created great unemployment and dissatisfaction."

How did the concept of money first originate, and what is the vital difference between such a money as the colonists devised, and the more convoluted instrument issued in its stead by the Bank of England — prototype of the central banking systems of the present world?

One day, a producer of a given product was approached by another. The latter said, "I have not yet produced the thing(s) which I will in turn present to you, which I can produce if you first produce the thing(s) I ask of you."

The first saw the prospective benefit of this commitment, should the second be so good as to perform the resultant obligation. Trust was involved; and the "money" that was thus created was comprised of the incumbent trust.

Money was created when the debtor was willing to attest to their obligation. The obligation was so much as penned to paper, which in turn represented the value, and very immutable units of, that which they promised to deliver. The paper, new money itself, held by the creditor party of the trade, was evidence of the debt. The value of the money held by the creditor was a promise to pay — a note.12

A note is only so good as the integrity and capacity of the debtor to fulfill their obligation. No note, regardless of who issues it, is any better.

How do we emulate free, unimpeded trade by management of a circulation; and what properties must a commerce system provide, that it not impose injustice on its subjects?

If the value of our original note were diminished over time, the creditor might receive less than the intended obligation of the debtor, or vice versa. In order not to subvert the purposes of trade commitments or corrupt the value or cost of accumulated savings or assets, the value of currency must be consistent across time.

---

12 note: A note is a promise to pay. Modern currencies are originally issued as debts. The value of the currency is comprised of, and represents, the original commitment of the debtor to fulfill the obligation.
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How is money to be introduced to the circulation?

The answer to this question rests on the further questions, must money represent debt; and when should money come into existence?

When new prosperity is rendered, and if money is to represent debt, and if the circulation is to represent the value of all things related to it, the singular place and time money can be and must be introduced to circulation, is when new wealth is created. If a circulation is to represent the value of things in part by constant proportion to those things, and if it is undesirable that a circulation impede trade, then the volume of circulation must be equal to the value of the volume of things for which it was created, and which might be traded, all at once, by it. Nothing less than such a circulation provides for full, immediate trade.

The need for further circulation thus coincides with the production of new wealth. This therefore is when new circulation must be introduced; and the quantity to be introduced must be equal to the new wealth.

Distribution of the circulation is readily solved. Where new circulation is required, it is distributed to the producer of the new wealth, and the consumer of the wealth assumes a debt equal to the original value of the wealth.

Rate of payment is also readily solved. Only by paying against just such debts at the rate of consumption, is money in circulation kept equal to the current value of debt-related wealth; and then, and then only, are we paying only for what we consume, with an equal measure of our own production.

Only in such a system is the circulation always adequate to pay all debt; is there no inflation or deflation; is there no manipulation of value or cost by scarcity of circulation; is there no impediment to prosperity for scarcity of circulation; and is there no multiplication of debt in proportion to commerce, as inherent to interest.

Here and here alone, have we replicated entirely the conditions and interaction of our original two, unimpeled traders.

By agreeing together to issue and regulate such a currency by such a prescription, the integrity of the currency is further assured by society together (government) holding debtors accountable to fulfill the obligations represented by the "money." This was the apparent conviction of the American Colonists, who fought a revolution to defend their currency.

A government of free people and representing free people, such as the original United States Government, was not established to profit from the people. It could not enrich itself from their trades because all of its money had to be gold and silver.

The history of the American "Economy" led indirectly to a far different end than the founders fought for. In a century of strife, descendants of the original central bankers the American public had cast off, ultimately were successful in imposing just such a privately owned "banking" system as necessary to issue a currency with the additional attribute and ramifications of "interest."

Under the so-called "Federal Reserve" System — a conglomerate of international banks — a currency would be issued such as engendered the hunger and homelessness Franklin explained compelled the American Revolution.

What is the distinct nature of the central banker's interest bearing debt currency\textsuperscript{13}; and what are the consequences of it?

The currency and interaction of modern central banks is analogous to a third party imposing upon our original two-party trade.

This third party, by nature extrinsic to the trade, produces nothing, and intrinsically contributes nothing to commerce. The extrinsic party writes the obligation to pay for the debtor party, and makes the obligation to pay no better than the debtor party's original promise, but adds to the cost of the transaction, whatever "interest" they coerce from the debtor by virtue of the need for such a token of exchange, as necessary to convey the diverse and dissimilar products of modern commerce.

The entire body of vying commerce then is reduced to a pool of debtors committed to deliver debt-and-interest obligations which, from the very beginning, exceed the entire such circulation.

\textsuperscript{13} interest-bearing debt currency: A currency loaned into circulation, and comprising a debt subject to "interest."

The Great IRS Hoax: Why We Don't Owe Income Tax, version 4.54
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The central banker has provided the original traders nothing they aren't fully capable of providing themselves, and something they certainly are fully capable of providing, in concert with further traders, to all commerce together. But by displacing such an equitable system with a paper or coin currency, the essential promises of which no banker fulfills, the system is subject to profit by interest, and the additional ramifications of interest — whatever those ramifications be.

What are the ramifications of "interest?"

In order to maintain the circulation vital to repaying their debts, and vital to sustaining the further, greater commerce necessary to repaying the obligations of those debts, which include interest, the subjects of the system are compelled to re-borrow what they pay against principal and interest as subsequent debts, increased so much as periodic interest

So long as the system exists — so long as interest exists — debt is multiplied in proportion to a circulation, or the commerce which can be sustained by it. Ever more of the circulation must be devoted to servicing debt, altogether, at the ever greater profit of the central bankers, who provide no contribution to prosperity, for the mere, ostensible service of qualifying our credit-worthiness, and counting what we pay them in multiples of our own production.

As the sum of debt is multiplied, greater sums of interest are paid and re-borrowed; and thus debt increases by ever greater increments of periodic interest.

Ultimately, one thing — debt service — increasing in proportion to another — the capacity of commerce to support and survive debt — exceeds the latter.

While a society might issue and regulate its circulation without limitation and for the mere costs of qualifying creditworthiness (without impeding credit-worthiness) and accounting for (far less) payment of debt... from the very beginning a central banking system establishes total debts (principal plus interest) which cannot be paid by the circulation, and which, in order to maintain the vital circulation, inherently and irreversibly multiply debt to our ever greater detriment, and ultimate imposition of system-wide insoluble debt.

So, we see, modern "capitalism" is not true, free enterprise; and the nature of money is critical to the vitality and freedom of enterprise. By mandating that gold and silver be the basis for all money in the American Constitution, and because gold and silver are limited commodities that cannot arbitrarily be created, the founders endowed us with a monetary system that provided "perfect separation between money and state", which kept politicians from interfering with and profiting unjustly from our trade. Because this system was so perfect in isolating money from politics, the politicians had to invent a way to end the coupling of gold with money, and they did this through a succession of devious machinations over the years:

1. The Federal Reserve Act was passed in 1913 right after the Sixteenth Amendment was passed allegedly authorizing an income tax. See sections 2.8.10 and 6.4.1 for further details. The income tax provided a way to “sop up” excess government dollars in circulation put there by a spend-a-holic government so that hyperinflation could be prevented if government printing of money got out of control.

2. The coupling of gold to money was undermined in 1933 when Franklin D. Roosevelt introduced the Trading with the Enemy Act and recalled all the gold in circulation as currency and made it illegal inside the federal zone to own gold. See section 6.4.2 for further details on this scam.

3. President Nixon completely eliminated the coupling of gold to money in 1971 by outlawing the redemption of federal reserve notes for gold.

After these “reforms and improvements” were made to our monetary system, we were transformed to more closely follow the central banking model used by most other tyrannical socialistic European governments at the time. We also had an economy ripe for inflation and instability and one where our government could print as much money as it wanted and thereby lower the value of the currency in exchange, and this is exactly what they did. In the early 1980’s following President Nixon’s decision to eliminate redeemability of Federal Reserve Notes in gold, interest and inflation rates climbed as high as 20% per year and this had been unheard of in all the previous history of America when we were on the gold standard.

If you would like to know more about the concept of “Separation of Money and State”, we refer you to the website below:

---

14 periodic interest: Interest paid in any period of examination. The periodic interest of a year is the interest paid over the period of a year.

The Great IRS Hoax: Why We Don’t Owe Income Tax, version 4.54
TOP SECRET: For Official Treasury/IRS Use Only (FOUO) Copyright Family Guardian Fellowship http://famguardian.org/
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2.8.9.3 The Founders Rejected Paper Currency

Today, inflation is a way of life and America isn't just swimming in debt, it's drowning. Consumer credit debt and business loans are at an all-time high. Many state and city governments are nearly broke and Orange County, California declared bankruptcy at one time.

Everyone knows that borrowing results in debt. But does anyone know what it is that is actually being borrowed?

1. Is it credit or money?
2. And is there any difference?
3. What exactly is money?
4. A circulating medium of exchange?
5. A store of intrinsic value?
6. Evidence of credit or debt, or all of these?

Gold and silver, on the other hand, represent a finite amount of stored value that has been mined and refined through the toil and sweat of human labor and cannot simply be printed into existence as needed. Precious metals have intrinsic, inherent value. Inflation is the condition where each newly printed and circulating paper dollar reduces the value of all other dollars already in circulation.

The Founders expressly state their firm desire to never allow a paper currency here in America. According to the records of the Constitutional Convention, the suggestion that the federal government be given the power to "emit bills of credit"—meaning to issue paper money—was angrily denounced and voted down. One of the reasons the constitutional convention was called was that the Continental Dollar had just collapsed, having gone from 8:1 against the Spanish milled dollar to 1,000:1 within just one year. Barber shops and other establishments were wallpapering their rooms with Continentals, they were so worthless.

The Founder's personal experience with the then recent hyperinflation and collapse of the paper Continental Dollar, combined with their knowledge of the inflationary history of central governments in England and Europe, had taught them that rulers inevitably resort to the printing press to create as much new money as needed until their inflated paper currencies became worthless. The Founders knew that paper money is artificial money, unlike gold and silver which are valuable, durable, and limited in supply. This was exemplified in the writings of Thomas Jefferson, the author of our Declaration of Independence:

"Paper is poverty,... it is only the ghost of money, and not money itself."
[Thomas Jefferson to Edward Carrington, 1788. ME 7:36 ]

"That paper money has some advantages is admitted. But that its abuses also are inevitable and, by breaking up the measure of value, makes a lottery of all private property, cannot be denied."
[Thomas Jefferson to Josephus B. Stuart, 1817. ME 15:113 ]

"It is a cruel thought, that, when we feel ourselves standing on the firmest ground in every respect, the cursed arts of our secret enemies, combining with other causes, should effect, by depreciating our money, what the open arms of a powerful enemy could not."

In How To Achieve Personal and Financial Privacy In a Public Age, author Mark Nestmann writes:

Gold is still the ultimate store of wealth. It's the world's only true money. And there isn't much of it to go around. All of it ever mined would fit into a small building—a 56 foot cube. The annual world production would fit into a 14 foot cube, roughly the size of an ordinary living room. If each Chinese citizen were to buy just one ounce, it would take up the annual supply for the next 200 years.

[How To Achieve Personal and Financial Privacy In a Public Age, Mark Nestmann]

Making Sense Out Of The Dollar, published in September 1, 1980, by the American Institute For Economic Research, Great Barrington, Massachusetts, stated:
When President Nixon nullified the U.S. promise to pay dollars for dollar claims in 1971, the U.S. monetary unit was changed from gold to a nothing. Obviously the two monetary units are vastly different, inasmuch as the former was a "dollar," the later cannot also be a "dollar." Fiat monetary units have a perfect record of failure, and when they are viewed as nothing units, that outcome is more plainly understandable.

How was the dollar once connected to gold? The U.S. Congress authorized the minting of gold coins on April 1, 1792, with a dollar specified as 24.75 grains of pure gold. This established a "price" for gold of $19.39 per troy ounce (480 grains per troy ounce divided by 24.785 grams per dollar equals 19.39 dollars per troy ounce).

In 1834 the gold content of the ten dollar coin produced by the U.S. Mint, the "eagle," was reduced from 247.5 grains to 232 grains of pure gold, establishing one dollar as 23.20 grains and a gold price of $20.67 per ounce. In 1934 President Roosevelt devalued the dollar to 13.71 grains of pure gold. This raised the "price" to $35.00 per ounce.

On August 15, 1971 President Nixon declared that the U.S. Treasury no longer would meet its promise to pay gold, in exchange for dollar claims. By 1971, nearly all of the paper currency in circulation consisted of Federal Reserve Notes in various denominations. A demand "note" ordinarily is evidence of a promise to pay or to deliver something on demand. For many years this was indicated by a printed statement on the paper currency to the effect that the U.S. Treasury would deliver the indicated number of dollars (amount of gold) on demand in exchange for the paper claims to the dollars.

As new paper currency was printed after 1971, the promise to pay was deleted from the Federal Reserve notes. Although still designated as a "note," which ordinarily implies a promise to pay something on demand or at some designated future time, the Federal Reserve notes now issued not only do not represent anything (as did gold certificates or silver certificates) but also they do not promise anything. They do not even purport to be anything other than identical pieces of paper printed with varying numbers.

Such a piece of paper currency is a no-thing having exchange value as a physical substance. Moreover, it does not even purport to be a claim on anything. Today's dollar is totally a fiat currency. Fiat money is nonredeemable paper, a no-thing. As long as people will continue to give something for nothing, as long as there are human "sheep" willing to be shorn, as long as savings can so readily be embezzled by depreciating the money in use, the "game" can go on.

[Making Sense of the Dollar, American Institute For Economic Research, Great Barrington, Massachusetts, 1980]

### 2.8.9.4 War of Independence Fought Over Paper Money

Most Americans are never taught that the real reason the War For Independence was fought was over paper money. In his book *The Almighty Buck*, Nord Davis writes:

> In 1763, Benjamin Franklin, a patriot who spoke too frankly, was in England and approached by a Rothschild banker who asked him the reason for the prosperity of the colonies. Franklin replied: "That is simple. In the Colonies we issue our own money called colonial scrip. We issue it in proportion to the demands of trade and industry."
>

[The Almighty Buck, Nord Davis]

It didn't take long for the Rothschilds to react to that bit of information. In 1764, the Rothschild Bank of England used its influence on the Crown of England to have a Law passed which prohibited the American colonies from issuing their own temporary legal tender scrip and making it compulsory for the colonies to obtain all their currency at interest from the Bank of England.

Our American forefathers were obliged to surrender their colonial scrip and then to mortgage their colonial assets and securities to the Bank of England just to borrow the money to carry on business. According to Franklin:

> "One year the conditions were so reversed that the era of Prosperity ended, and a depression set in, to such an extent that the streets were filled with unemployed. The Bank of England refused to give more than 50% of the face value of the scrip when turned over as required by law. The circulating medium was thus cut in half..."

[Benjamin Franklin]

The famous lexicographer, Daniel Webster, issued the following warning:

> Of all contrivances for cheating the laboring classes of mankind, none has been more effective than that which deludes them with paper money.

[Daniel Webster]
Quoting from *Economic Solutions* by Peter Kershaw:

The Founding Fathers of this great land had no difficulty whatsoever understanding the agenda of bankers, and they frequently referred to them and their kind as, quote, 'friends of paper money.'

They hated the Bank of England, in particular, and felt that even were we successful in winning our independence from England and King George, we could never truly be a nation of freemen unless we had an honest money system.

*[Economic Solutions, Peter Kershaw]*

John Adams wrote in a letter to Thomas Jefferson in 1787:

All the perplexities, confusion and distress in America rise, not from defects in their Constitution or Confederation, not from want of honor or virtue, so much as from downright ignorance of the nature of coin, credit, and circulation.

*[John Adams to Thomas Jefferson, 1787]*

The founders emblazoned their clear understanding of the necessity of a stable commodity money in the form of gold and silver by explicitly stating in the Constitution under Article 1, Section 8 that the federal government may "coin money" and "regulate the value thereof" and under Article 1, Section 10, that the States are forbidden, mind you, to "make any thing but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts."

Author Byron Dale in his book *Bashed By the Bankers*, writes:

During the years immediately preceding adoption of the Constitution, mobs drove our Congress from Philadelphia into New Jersey and shot up the courthouses in Massachusetts. These events were illustrative of the general situation existing throughout the country with respect to Law and order. Money was worth anywhere from two and a half cents on the dollar down to nothing. Credit was ruined, trade paralyzed and discipline at a low ebb. Anarchy, bankruptcy and confusion prevailed.

*[Bashed By the Bankers, Byron Dale]*

On February 3, 1787, George Washington wrote to Henry Knox as follows:

If any... person had told me that there would have been such formidable rebellion as exists, I would have thought him a...fit subject for a mad house.

*[George Washington to Henry Knox, February 3, 1787]*

Washington then wrote several letters over the next few years in which he said that if anyone had predicted the stunningly fast and enormous improvements in the economy brought about by the gold clause in the Constitution:

"...it would have been considered a species of madness."

Three short years after the Constitution had been written and ratified and the new government set up, Washington wrote on June 3, 1790 to the Marquis de LaFayette:

You have doubtless been informed...of the happy progress of our affairs...our revenues have been considerably more productive than it was imagined they would be.

*[George Washington to Marquis de LaFayette, June 3, 1790]*

On July 19, 1791, Washington wrote to Catherine Macauloy Graham, saying:

The United States enjoys a scene of prosperity and tranquility under the new government that could hardly have been hoped for.

*[George Washington in a letter to Catherine Macauloy Graham]*

On December 16, 1789, the Pennsylvania Gazette wrote:

Since the federal constitution has removed all danger of our having paper tender, our trade is advanced fifty percent...

*[Pennsylvania Gazette, December 16, 1789]*
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2.8.9.5  President Thomas Jefferson: Foe of Paper Money

In 1791, Congress passed a Law chartering the Bank of the United States. The bill was drafted by Alexander Hamilton, a monarchist, and then Secretary of the Treasury. It was opposed by Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson who claimed it was unconstitutional and created a powerful agency for the monopoly of money.

After a long debate, Congress passed the bill establishing a twenty-year charter for the first United States Bank. It was not owned by the United States government, but by the private individuals who owned stock in the bank, many of whom lived in England and also owned stock in the Bank of England.

In 1802, Thomas Jefferson wrote in a letter to then Secretary of Treasury Albert Gallatin:

> If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency, first by inflation and then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around them will deprive the people of all property until their children will wake up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered.

Mr. Jefferson also warned:

> I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies...the issuing of power should be taken from the banks and restored to the people to whom it properly belongs.

In 1792, a bill came before Congress to renew the charter which was to expire in 1811. During consideration of the bill, Mr. Porter, a member of Congress, stated that it would:

> Plant in the bosom of the Constitution a viper which...will sting the liberties of this country to the heart.

[Congressional Record, Mr. Porter, 1792]

Mr. Wright said: "The charter is a cancer upon the body politic."

Mr. Boyd stated: "The bank is a great swindle."

The bill was killed.

2.8.9.6  Wealth confiscation through inflation

> "Inflation is the one form of taxation that can be imposed without legislation." -- Milton Friedman

> "By a continuing process of inflation, governments can confiscate, secretly and unobserved, an important part of the wealth of their citizens. There is no subtler, no surer means of overturning the existing basis of society than to debauch the currency. The process engages all the hidden forces of economic law on the side of destruction, and does it in a manner which not one man in a million is able to diagnose".

[John Maynard Keynes, economist and author of "The Economic Consequences Of The Peace"]

Kenneth Gerbino, former chairman of the American Economic council stated:

> Historically, the United States has been a hard money country. Only [since 1913] has the United States operated on a fiat money system. During this period, paper money has depreciated over 87%. During the preceding 140 year period, the hard currency of the United States had actually maintained its value. Wholesale prices in 1913...were the same as in 1787."

Quoting from The Creature From Jekyll Island, author G. Edward Griffin writes:

> Inflation has now been institutionalized at a fairly constant 5% per year. This has been scientifically determined to be the optimum level for generating the most revenue without causing public alarm.

> A 5% devaluation applies, not only to the money earned this year, but to all that is left over from previous years. At the end of the first year, a dollar is worth 95 cents. At the end of the second year, the 95 cents is reduced again
by 5%, leaving its worth at 90 cents, and so on. By the time a person has worked 20 years, the government will have confiscated 64% of every dollar he saved over those years. By the time he has worked 45 years, the hidden tax will be 90%.

The government will take virtually everything a person saves over a lifetime.

In 1920, at the conclusion of World War I, noted economist John Maynard Keynes stated in his book *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*:

*By a continuing process of inflation, governments can confiscate secretly and unobserved, an important part of the wealth of their citizens. There is no subtler, no surer means of overturning the existing basis of society than to debauch the currency.*

*The process engages all the hidden forces of economic Law on the side of destruction, and does it in a manner which not one man in a million is able to diagnose.*

In that same book, Keynes also wrote:

*If governments should refrain from regulation...the worthlessness of the money becomes apparent and the fraud upon the public can be concealed no longer.*

In 1946, a postage stamp cost 3 cents, a one pound loaf of bread 10 cents, a quart of milk 18 cents, a gallon of gas 21 cents, an average new home $12,638, and the average new car $1,649. Compare those prices to today's costs for the same items.

Today's Federal Reserve Note will purchase less than 10 cents of what it would buy as recently as 1940. Workers earn more today than in the 40's, but their salaries have not kept up with inflation. Therefore, the average American is slipping further and further toward poverty.

In 1946, a man could easily support his family with just one job. Today, it is the norm for both parents to be forced to work at least one job each just to make ends meet.

Have you ever stopped to think that this massive inflation has literally stolen trillions of dollars of America's wealth and productivity over the course of just a few generations? It may well be the most insidious tax ever collected.

### 2.8.9.7 The Most Dangerous Man in the Mid South

(from the 2/97 Chronicles, the American Culture Magazine)

By Franklin Sanders

In 1967, Alan Greenspan was already a fairly well known economic consultant. In the 1970s, President Ford appointed him to his Council of Economic Advisors. In 1987, Alan Greenspan was appointed Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors.

Funny, he doesn't talk much about gold anymore.

In 1967, I was a college senior. Susan and I were married on December 16th, and when I graduated in 1968 the draft board gave me 30 days' to frolic before conscription. I arrived at Fort Polk, Louisiana one hot October night, caught the Army bus out to the post and sat down behind the driver, facing across the bus. I opened my copy of Aristotle's Works and began reading.

I noticed I was the only man on board with hair. The fellow sitting across from me asked, "Whatcha reading?" Wordlessly, I flipped up the book so he could read the title on the spine. "Boy, he said without any reflection. "Have you come to the wrong place."

---

In 1969 I retired from the Army to attend graduate school in German at Tulane University. The next year I received a full scholarship to the Free University in West Berlin, where I saw firsthand what unchallenged state power could do. The West was pulsing with life and light, the East dead and empty. In the Museum of the Wall at Checkpoint Charlie I read the last radio message from the Free Hungarians in 1956: "Tell Europe we are dying for them."

After Susan and I came home late in 1973 I worked in several businesses, learning firsthand what it means to "make your way in the world." I kept studying economics and monetary systems, on my own and in graduate classes.

In 1980 I opened my own business in West Memphis, Arkansas, across the Mississippi from Memphis, selling physical gold and silver. First thing I did was write to the Arkansas Attorney General to explain that I thought exchanges of gold and silver money for paper money weren't subject to the sales tax, since they were exchanges of money for money. What was his official position?

He never bothered to answer my certified letter. Or the second. Or the third.

When he finally responded, it was only to say he wouldn't answer. I wrote to the Commissioner of Revenue, and told him what I was doing. Nobody ever bothered to answer that certified letter either, so I reported all my sales as "exempt". Every month.

A year later, in 1981, a Revenue officer showed up to audit my books. I told her what I did wasn't taxable, and that every trade contract contained a confidentiality guarantee to my customer. She could see them if she would indemnify me in case some customer sued for breach of contract. Alas, she didn't want to co-operate, so she just multiplied all my "exempt" sales by the sales tax percentage, added penalties and interest, and sent me a bill for about $30,000.

Thus began my merry pilgrimage through the courts. I had landed smack in the middle of Legal Never-Neverland: monetary law. Of course Article I, Section 10 of the U.S. Constitution says, "No State shall make any Thing but Gold and Silver Coin a tender in payment of debt." Of course the definition of "money" at the head of the Arkansas tax title says, "The term 'money' or 'monies' shall be had to mean and include gold and silver coin." Of course the Title 12 or the U.S. Code, Section 152 says that "lawful money" means gold and silver coin of the United States.

Of course, of course, of course . . . it goes on and on. State and federal constitutions, state and federal statutes, state and federal court decisions, US supreme court decisions, all speak with one voice: gold and silver coin are money, bank notes are not money. But whether I raised the issue in a Revenue Department administrative court, chancery court, or federal district court, I ran into the same terrified reaction. "The monetary emperor is naked! Federal Reserve notes aren't really money! Quick, rule against this clown and drag him out of here!"

I appealed the agent's assessment, and lost at the administrative level. Then at the administrative court, too. I appealed to chancery court. Had a trial. Lost there, too. By then it was December, 1983, and I received a letter from the Arkansas Revenue Department demanding I fork over $120,000!

A few days later two deputies came to collect their "judgment." Through several well-nigh miraculous providences, they got nothing. That night, I decamped from Arkansas. I was so amazed at God's protection through this event that I wrote a friend a long letter about it. Remember that letter.

I moved my business to Tennessee, doing exactly the same thing, exchanging gold and silver money for federal reserve notes. By this time I had realized that although every American had a constitutional and legal right to gold and silver money, the problem was, you couldn't use them in everyday business. We had the right to sound money, but no means. We needed an interface between the paper system and gold and silver.

So in May, 1984 I opened a gold and silver bank. It attracted depositors like wildfire, but somebody didn't like my idea. On June 18, 1985, two IRS Criminal Investigation Division (CID) agents popped in to announce that I was under criminal investigation. ["Surprise! We just dropped by to pull out your fingernails with pliers!"].

In the next three years IRS treated me to the full court press. They got my bank records, and on US attorney's stationery wrote all my customers, demanding that they send records from their dealings with me to the IRS CID agent and threatening the recalcitrant with subpoenas. These letters remarkably chilled my customers' enthusiasm. It got harder and harder to make a living.
On September 18, 1986, five agents from the Tennessee Revenue Department appeared at my office with a search warrant, pawed my files and records for two hours, and hauled off boxes of personal papers. That was the first -- and last -- I heard of them for a long time. They immediately turned over my papers to the IRS.

In the spring of 1988 the IRS and the US Attorney's office leap-frogged their investigation from me to my church. There was nothing unusual about the church. It wasn't a "tax protest" church, just a member congregation of the conservative Presbyterian Church in America. The assistant US attorney subpoenaed church members before the grand jury and grilled them about what the church taught. Did the pastor teach people how to not file income tax returns? Did the church have militia practice in the woods? Survival training? Did the church hand back contributions under the table? About the only thing they didn't accuse us of was trafficking in nuclear warheads.

We landed in the Catch 22 maelstrom of official suspicion. The more the pastor and the elders proved to the US attorney's office that these accusations were lies, the more convinced they became that we were such clever conspirators that their suspicions must be true. The assistant US attorney issued a subpoena to the church for all her records: counseling, sessional, financial, everything. The session of the church offered to consider any request for specific documents, but refused to open the Bride of Christ up to a fishing expedition.

On January 9, 1990, just at dawn, the IRS struck. Although the agent investigating me knew very well that I was not violent, IRS agents and Tennessee Revenue Department agents roared in my driveway while the SWAT team in their black ninja suits poured out of the woods on either side of my house.

They attacked with reckless, malicious disregard for the safety of my wife and seven (7) children. All they needed to do was pick up the phone and tell me I had been indicted, and I would have gone downtown. No, these IRS thugs wanted headlines from a sensational "pre-dawn raid" to scare the sheep for tax season, and to make me and my wife, the mother of my seven children, look violent and dangerous.

After they arrested me and Susan, the IRS refused to leave my home. Contrary to the law and over the protest of my spunky 15 year old daughter, Liberty, three IRS agents stayed and held my children hostage until the end of the day. They were waiting for a search warrant so they could come back and steal my records and my computer.

On the ride downtown I had no idea what was going on. Why would they arrest Susan? She had never done anything other than minor secretarial work in my business, and spent all her waking hours home-schooling and raising children.

When I stepped into the jail cell, I began to understand. They had indicted her to blackmail me. My friends, customers of the gold and silver bank, and numerous church members were already there, including my pastor and assistant pastor. The indictment was an inch thick. In 72 pages it charged 26 defendants with conspiracy to defraud the government, willful failure to file, and diverse other malefactions.

The government claimed that the gold and silver bank was a tax evasion scheme to hide income. Not even two years in the US Army had prepared me for stupidity of this magnitude. How could we hide income when almost everything we took in was in checks, and we deposited the checks into our bank account? Oh, yes, we did pass some of the checks along to other dealers to pay for gold or silver we bought for them, a common practice in the industry and perfectly legal. This, the government taught us, was "laundering checks," a sinister activity proving we were up to no good. But every bank deposit I had made was a count on the indictment! And Susan -- poor home-making, home-schooling, never-stop-running Susan -- was the Number Two conspirator, right after me!

My bond was set at $150,000, fully secured. For comparison, that same day they arrested a child molester and set his bond at $10,000, not secured. I stayed in jail from Tuesday until Friday, when my parents put up their house to get me out of jail.

When the Federal marshals released me at 5:00 p.m., sheriff's deputies were waiting to arrest me, and me alone, on state charges.

I believe but cannot yet prove that an ex-IRS agent had been sent to work for the Tennessee revenue department to get the search warrant IRS couldn't get, and to figure out some way to charge me under state law. (You're not paranoid if somebody is really persecuting you.) I was charged with violating a statute that had been on the books nineteen years: TCA 67-1-1440(d), "delaying and depriving the state of revenue to which it was lawfully entitled at the time it was lawfully entitled thereto." In all those 19 years, not a single Tennessean had discovered how to violate it, but I had. Truth to tell, I hadn't even figured it out, since I was accused of "delaying & depriving" the state of revenue the amount of which was unknown and to
which the state had never become lawfully entitled. They accused me of a crime I could not possibly have committed because
I didn't know it existed. Never mind, due process just slows things down.

They were charging me with not collecting sales tax on exchanges of gold and silver money for paper money. You know --
like when you go to the bank, and give the teller a twenty and she gives you back a ten and two fives, less sales tax. What?
She doesn't charge you sales tax? Of course not, because it's an exchange of money for money.

But neither the state of Tennessee nor any other state can admit that gold and silver coin are money. If they do, they will
admit they are operating outside the law. The monetary emperor is naked, and state officials from the Chief Justice of the
supreme court to the governor to the second assistant tire checker are afraid to tell him. They should be afraid, because the
monopoly on money creation is the jugular vein of the American fascist state.

But in January, 1990, I didn't have time to worry about state charges. Susan and I were both facing 19 years in jail if convicted
in federal court. We knew the statistics, too. Humanly speaking, we had no chance. Ninety-eight percent of federal tax
prosecutions end in guilty verdicts.

The next year and a half was a wretched struggle to persevere without despair. Only a survivor of a criminal prosecution
could understand how it hammers your soul. Most defendants never make it to trial. Through the investigation alone, federal
agents and prosecutors can destroy their businesses and their families, and break their spirit. Stripped of business, money,
family, and hope, most plead guilty just to end the nightmare. In our case one poor defendant pled guilty with no idea what
it meant. When a defense attorney asked him who he had conspired with, he screwed up his face in confusion and paused
several minutes. "I dunno. Myself, I guess!"

Our trial began on February 26, 1991, over a year after our arrest. Right after the noon break that first day, I received word
that our sons Wright (10) and Christian (8) had been severely burned playing with gasoline. Susan spent the first two weeks
of trial with them in the hospital.

Just when it seemed that things couldn't get worse, they did. Day after day I had to listen as the prosecutor hatefully twisted
everything I had ever done into something evil -- including the good things. This went on for four and a half long months.
The government entered immaterial documents by the hundredweight.

The vast but tediously shallow silliness of the whole farce made me the maddest. Do you remember in C.S. Lewis' Perelandra,
when the Unman is struggling to convince the Green Lady to disobey Maleldil's command not to spend the night on the land?
Ransom notes with dismay the childish silliness of evil. Throughout the night while the Green Lady sleeps, the Unman
repeats, "Ransom? Ransom?" When Ransom answers, "What?", the Unman responds, "Nothing." At its depths, evil is not
noble or grand. It's merely a silly, spoiled child, flicking boogers at his betters.

To the charges of "willful failure to file income tax returns" we argued that no statute makes anyone liable for an income tax
(except "foreign withholding agents"). No one -- not the federal district court judge, not the assistant US attorney, not the
IRS, no one -- was able to point out that statute, because it doesn't exist.

Here was a "man bites dog" story if ever there was one, but was the local media interested? Hardly. The first day of trial was
covered by an old reporter for the Commercial Appeal who with great insight described issues and characters. Next day he
was yanked off the case and replaced with a Stalinist "comrade" who loyally published whatever official line the US attorney's
office gave him.

But our jury was more open-minded. On July 9, 1991, the jury returned its verdict: seventeen defendants not guilty on all
counts! To God be the glory! We threw an enormous party and that Sunday had one bodacious worship service.

I still had to face a state trial. I no more than caught my breath when I had to dive back down into the sewage of the "justice
system."

The trial started in May, 1992, and lasted three weeks. The judge and the prosecution did their best to keep out my evidence
-- evidence that showed how many hundreds of hours I had haunted the law library to study out my position and make sure I
was right.
It did little good. Remember the letter I wrote a friend when I escaped from Arkansas? The Revenue Department had seized it in 1986, and the prosecutrix used it to make me look like a hypocrite.

Even at that, three jurors held out for three days. I later talked to one of the holdouts, and he said that one of the women who gave up said, "Oh, well, he'll get another trial on appeal." Can people really be that ignorant, or will they just use any excuse to justify their own cowardice? On May 18, 1992 I was convicted on two counts of "delaying and depriving."

A month later the judge sentenced me to two years in jail, but he suspended all but 30 days, provided I would pay $1,000 a month for 73 months as "restitution" and do 1,000 hours (half a year's work) of community service. With seven children to support, it was a deal I couldn't refuse.

I appealed. In August, 1994 the Court of Criminal Appeals overturned one count of the conviction for double jeopardy. I couldn't be guilty of one count of "delaying" and one count of "depriving" for the very same conduct. On the money issue, however, the real heart of the case, the court dodged and denied all my arguments.

We appealed to the Tennessee Supreme Court, and they heard the case on All Saints Day, 1995. Dr. Edwin Vieira, Jr., constitutional attorney and America's foremost expert on monetary law, prepared the briefs and argued the case. For over 6 months we heard nothing. Then on May 28, 1996 the Supreme Court affirmed my conviction, once again dodging the money issue.

I am still appealing, this time into the federal system, but the appeal couldn't be filed quickly enough to prevent my arrest on June 28, 1996. The petition for habeas corpus in federal district court was assigned to the same judge who had tried our federal case. She took jurisdiction of the appeal, but refused to order my release. From June 28th until July 23rd, I was a guest of the Shelby County Jail and the Shelby County Penal Farm.

The next hurdle is securing a stay of execution on the $72,000 fine. Failing that, I go back to jail for another eleven months while the appeal goes on.

Why keep on fighting? After 15 years, why not just put down the load and forget it?

Because the fiat money system is both the strength and weakness of America's tyrants. It bleeds the people's wealth and labor, but it also threatens to collapse under its own weight — or whenever the scales fall off the people's eyes. With its green engravings of famous Americans, electrons whirling around in bank computers, and loans created out of thin air, it is one vast confidence game. As long as the people believe they can't see the emperor's naked pink flesh, his power and dignity will be preserved. But let one little boy hollers, "Hey, he's nekkid!" and the tyranny collapses.

I didn't sally forth looking for dragons to slay. The dragon came to me. He came with a lie, and either you oppose a lie, or you become a liar. You can kid yourself and say I'm only going along because they have all the guns, but day by day, year by year, your integrity erodes. Finally, you become like the tyrants: just one more liar.

Even if you have no chance to win, you have to fight. Not many are willing, but even a few keep the tyrants from sleeping at night. If we don't fight, how many more Ruby Ridges and Wacos will there be? How many more SWAT team attacks? How many more police check points? How many more bureaucrats watching your bank account and your finances? How many more children held hostage by IRS agents? The bill of rights is already dead. Will it be time to fight when your wife and children are dead, too?

The US government spent millions of dollars trying to jail me and my wife and my pastor and assistant pastor. The assistant US attorney here told one lawyer that I was "the most dangerous man in the mid-South." In a four and a half year investigation the government spent $5 - $10 million, maybe more. We heard they spent nearly two million on the trial alone.

We can't both be right. Either the government is right and gold and silver coin is not money, or I am right. This is not a gentlemen's "difference of opinion."

If I'm right, and if I win in the courts, then no state will ever be able to charge sales tax on gold and silver coin again. The greatest disability to free trade in gold and silver will have been removed. We will have broken down the last illegal roadblock to sound metallic money.
Postscript: Because the conditions of probation were so burdensome on him and his family, Mr. Sanders returned to jail and was relocated to a medium-security prison on November 4, 1996. He was released on December 20, 1996.

2.8.9.8 What Type of “Money” Do You Pay Your Taxes With to the IRS?

Here is what the Constitution says about the federal authority to coin money in Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 5 and 18:

1. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

5. To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

18. To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

And in Article 1, Section 10 of the U.S. Constitution, we find:

"No State shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit letters of credit; make any thing but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts; pass any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility."

Sounds pretty basic to us. All money MUST be gold or silver or it isn’t money. In spite of this, the federal courts have still managed to sidestep this requirement and authorize paper money. The following cite from the case of Mathes v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 576 F.2d. 70 (1978) establishes that even though the Constitution requires all money to be backed by gold, the government can ignore that requirement completely anyway!

Taxpayers first assert that they have a legal right to choose a lawful method of reporting income which in their case is to report their income of “notes” in terms of lawful, statutory dollars. Taxpayers correctly state that “the legal right of a taxpayer to decrease the amount of what otherwise would be his taxes, or altogether avoid them, by means which the law permits, cannot be doubted.” Gregory v. Helvering, 293 U.S. 465, 469, 55 S.Ct. 266, 267, 79 L.Ed. 596 (1935). However, the method used by these taxpayers to reduce their taxes is not a legal method.

"Under the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States, and to issue circulating notes for the money borrowed, [Congress'] power to define the quality and force of those notes as currency is as broad as the like power over a metallic currency under the power to coin money and to regulate the value thereof. Under the two powers, taken together, Congress is authorized to establish a national currency, either in coin or in paper, and to make that currency lawful money for all purposes, as regards the national government or private individuals." . . . (Emphasis added)

Close to a century ago, the Supreme Court stated:

"About all a Federal Reserve note can legally do is wipe out one debt and replace it with itself another debt, a note that promises nothing. If anything's been paid, the payment occurs only in the minds of the parties...".

"Freedom is the absence of the awareness of restraint."

The key dates in the devolution of the Federal Reserve System (FRS) are as follows:
Chapter 2: U.S. Government Background

1913 - Congress creates the FRS; permits the emission of FRNs (Federal Reserve Notes), redeemable in "lawful money"; and declares FRNs to be "obligations of the United States", but not "legal tender". In practice, the Federal Reserve Banks and the United States Treasury redeem FRNs for gold coin on demand. FRNs are a fiduciary currency.

1933 - Congress repudiates redemption of FRNs in gold for United States citizens, and declares that FRNs shall be "legal tender". The government continues to redeem FRNs in gold for foreigners; and United States citizens can redeem FRNs for "lawful money" (such as United States Treasury Notes and silver certificates), which is redeemable in silver coins. Therefore, FRNs remain a fiduciary currency, redeemable directly in gold internationally and indirectly in silver domestically.

1968 - Congress repudiates redemption of all forms of "lawful money" in silver, thus turning FRNs into a fiat currency domestically for the first time.

1971 - President Nixon repudiates redemption of FRNs in gold, thus turning FRNs into a fiat currency internationally for the first time.

If you would like to learn more about the federal reserve after reading the following subsections, we refer you to two excellent books on the subject:

1. High Priests of Treason: The Federal Reserve, Mel Stamper, J.D.; Documentary Legal Services Publishing, 4457 US 1 South, Suite 103, St. Augustine, Florida 32086; ISBN 0-9647128-5-7. Mel Stamper admits he was compelled to write this book. He spent five years in the research and one year in the writing. In 1989, he stumbled upon a case of an income tax protester who had gone to prison on a charge of willful failure to file a tax return. The man's name was Bill Benson, and he and Red Beckman had written a book proving the 16th Amendment was a fraud. Becoming consumed with the story and its historical implications on American Society, he continued his investigation. The full impact of the conspiracy by the international bankers, and the high treason which resulted and continues, help create High Priests of Treason: The Federal Reserve

2. The Creature from Jekyll Island, G. Edward Griffin, 1998; American Media, P.O. Box 4646, Westlake Village, California 91359-1646; ISBN 0-912986-21-2. Where does money come from? Where does it go? Who makes it? The money magicians' secrets are unveiled. Here is a close look at their mirrors and smoke machines, the pulleys, cogs, and wheels that create the grand illusion called money. A boring subject? Just wait! You'll be hooked in five minutes. Reads like a detective story-which it really is. But it's all true. This book is about the most blatant scam of history. It's here: the cause of wars, boom-bust cycles, inflation, depression, prosperity. Your world view will definitely change. Putting it quite simply: this may be the most important book on world affairs you will ever read.

3. The Money Scam, Form #05.041
   https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

4. Money, Banking, and Credit Topic Page, Family Guardian Fellowship
   https://famguardian.org/Subjects/MoneyBanking/MoneyBanking.htm

2.8.10.1 Federal Reserve System Explained

The Federal Reserve System, America's new private, central bank, was modeled almost precisely after the Rothschilds' Bank of England and German's Reichsbank, the central bank which controlled money and credit in Germany, and whose principal stockholders were members of the Warburg family.

In Billions For the Bankers, Debts For the People, author Sheldon Emery writes:

"An economic conquest takes place when nations are placed under 'tribute' without the use of visual force, so that victims do not realize that they've been conquered. The conquest begins when the conquerors gain control of the monetary system of the nation.

Chapter 2: U.S. Government Background

The conquerors do not want to arouse suspicion, so they make gradual changes to their benefit. They slowly usurp financial assets of a nation. Tribute is collected from them in the form of 'legal' debts and taxes, which the people are led to believe is for their own good...although this method is much slower than a military conquest, it is longer lasting because the captives do not see any military force used against them.

The people are free to participate in the election of their rulers although the outcome is manipulated by those in control. Without realizing it, a nation is conquered. Their wealth is transferred to their captors and the conquest is complete."

[Billions for the Bankers, Debts For the People, Sheldon Emry; SOURCE:
https://sheldonemrylibrary.famguardian.org/Books/Books.htm]

The powerful European families who had backed England's losing military effort during the Revolutionary War would not patiently regain the American colony without firing a single shot. Three years after that still secret meeting, a mere handful of Senators, including none other than Senator Aldrich, rammed the Federal Reserve Act through Congress, after the opposition had already gone home for the holidays.

As author Devvy Kidd states in her booklet Why a Bankrupt America:

"At 6:00pm on December 23, 1913, while Congress was out of session, three Senators took it upon themselves to pass, by voice vote, the Federal Reserve Act of 1913. These three individuals handed over America's future and our economic system to a handful of private domestic individuals and foreign banking interests. Our Founding Fathers would have shouted: 'Treason!'"  
[Why a Bankrupt America, Devvy Kidd]

President Wilson, born in 1856, just 80 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, was a minister's son, a former historian, an educator and the author of the 1902 work A History of the American People in which he extolled Lincoln's debt-free "green-backs."

As a presidential candidate the People trusted when he pledged a money and credit system free from the influence of Wall Street, President Wilson was waiting in the Oval Office for the bill and signed it into Law one hour after its passage, thereby placing the U.S. into dependent debt slavery to foreign bankers.

Senator Charles Lindbergh, Sr., father of the famous aviator, and a fierce opponent of the bill, stated after its passage, and I quote:

"This Act establishes the most gigantic trust on earth...the invisible government by the money power will [now] be legalized. The new Law will create inflation whenever the trusts want inflation. From now on, depressions will be scientifically created."
[Senator Charles Lindberg]

2.8.10.2 Lewis v. United States Ruling

by: Jim Townsend
Re redeem Our Country (ROC) National Chairman

The Federal Reserve banks are privately owned, locally controlled, separate corporations. Who says so? In Lewis vs. United States, the Ninth Circuit Court says so. See Lewis v. U.S., 680 F.2d. 1238, 1241 (1982).

Thus, after years of senators and members of the House of Representatives denying the Federal Reserve banks were privately owned, the Ninth Circuit Court has finally, officially, given the lie to the scam imposed on the people of this country 70 years ago.

The court's decision has vast implications. Now that the bankers' hoax has been legally exposed, what impact will it have on the paper issued as Federal Reserve notes? As private bankers, it would appear they have no more right to issue and circulate their paper than does the local counterfeiter. In fact, if one could choose between the two, the local counterfeiter would be the one chosen, because he charges no interest on his paper. The Federal Reserve counterfeiter not only distributes worthless paper, he collects interest by loaning it into circulation.
The court decision has been known for more than three months, but the media has been as quiet as a mouse. Neither the printed nor electronic media has found it newsworthy, even though the ramifications will be mind boggling if the court decision stands.

Key members of the two houses of Congress were advised of the court findings, but, the public had not heard even a peep from the guardians of the public welfare. In fact, no one will admit to knowing anything about it. But they do know, and the question is:

“What are they going to do about it?”

There are so many things that come to mind when one realizes the Federal Reserve banks have been operating un-constitutionally for all these years, that it staggeres the imagination. What about homes the Federal Reserve member banks have foreclosed? What about the interest the United States has been paying on foreign loans negotiated by the same private bankers? Is this not a gift of the people's funds? What about the interest the Federal Reserve banks now collect on the national debt...would that not be declared illegal under the circuit court decision?

COURT QUOTED

Below, for the benefit of our readers, we are reprinting the main part of the Ninth Circuit Court's findings:

Examining the organization and function of the Federal Reserve Banks, and applying the relevant factors, we conclude that the Reserve Banks are not federal instrumentalities for purposes of the FTCA, but are independent, privately owned and locally controlled corporations.

Each Federal Reserve Bank is a separate corporation owned by commercial banks in its region. The stockholding commercial banks elect two thirds of each Bank's nine member board of directors. The remaining three directors are appointed but the Federal Reserve Board regulates the Reserve Banks, but direct supervision and control of each Bank is exercised by its board of directors. See 12 U.S.C. §301. The directors enact bylaws regulating the manner of conducting general Bank business, 12 U.S.C. §341, and appoint officers to implement and supervise daily Bank activities. Because these activities include collecting and clearing checks, making advances to private and commercial entities, holding reserves for member banks, discounting the notes of member banks, and buying and selling securities on the open market. See 12 U.S.C. §341-361.

Each Bank is statutorily empowered to conduct these activities without day to day direction from the federal government. Thus, for example, the interest rates on advances to member banks, individuals, partnerships, and corporations are set by each Reserve Bank and their decisions regarding the purchase and sale of securities are likewise independently made.

It is evident from the legislative history of the Federal Reserve Act that Congress did not intend to give the federal government direction over the daily operation of the Reserve Banks.

It is proposed that the Government shall retain sufficient power over the reserve banks to enable it to exercise a direct authority when necessary to do so, but that it shall in no way attempt to carry on through its own mechanism the routine operations and banking which require detailed knowledge of local and individual credit which determines the funds of the community in any given instance. In other words, the reserve-bank plan retains to the Government power over the exercise of the broader banking functions, while it leaves to individuals and privately owned institutions the actual direction of routine”--H.R. Report No. 69, 63 Cong. 1st Sess. 18-19 (1913)

The fact that the federal reserve Board regulates the Reserve Banks does not make them federal agencies under the Act. In United States v. Orleans, 425 U.S. 807, 96 S.Ct. 1971, 48 L.Ed.2d 390 (1976), the Supreme Court held that a community action agency was organized under federal regulations and heavily funded by the federal government, but by local officials, the Court refused to extend federal tort liability for negligence of the agency's employees. Similarly, the Federal Reserve Banks, through heavily regulated, are locally controlled by their member banks.

Unlike typical federal agencies, each bank is empowered to hire and fire employees at will. Bank employees do not participate in the Civil Service Retirement System. They are covered by worker's compensation insurance, purchased by the Bank, rather than the Federal Employees Compensation Act. Employees traveling on Bank business are not subject to federal travel regulations and to not receive government employee discounts on lodgings and services.

(The FTCA is the Federal Tort Claims Act)

There you have it. The high binding, swindling Federal Reserve banks are just what we have for years said they were, private corporations, which have bankrupted the country (SPOTLIGHT, July 30, 1979 and others). We now owe a bigger debt than...
the total net worth of the country. We pay this privileged and pampered class of counterfeiters almost 20 cents of every tax dollar collected—and it's going up.

END FOOLISHNESS

As Thomas Edison said:

"It's foolish to say we can issue a bond that is good, but not a dollar bill."

The time has come to return to a Constitutional money system that puts into circulation a debt-free dollar. Debt-free money would save the Social Security System, and put the 14 million unemployed workers back to work. Send your congressman a copy of the Ninth Circuit Court's decision and ask him what he is going to do about this private banking system. If he's for keeping it, you'll know what to do about him the next time you go to the polls.

(The SPOTLIGHT and the "National Educator" are the only two papers to carry this sensational information. Were it not for a tiny handful of such populist newspapers, who would tell you the truth? As H.L. Mencken once said, "I feel sorry for the man who, after reading the daily newspaper, goes to bed believing he knows something of what's going on in the world.")

After having read this article, it’s natural to ask: Who gave Congress, the Legislative branch, the authority to delegate to a private corporation a function that is actually authorized to be accomplished ONLY by the Treasury, which is part of the Executive Branch? According to the Supreme Court, they can’t! The fact that the Federal Reserve even exists is a clear violation of the Constitution. Here is what the court said about a similar, though not identical subject in the case of Butchers' Union Co. v. Crescent City Co., 111 U.S. 746 (1884):

> It cannot be permitted that, when the constitution of a state, the fundamental law of the land, has imposed upon its legislature the duty of guarding, by suitable laws, the health of its citizens, especially in crowded cities, and the protection of their person and property by suppressing and preventing crime, that the power which enables it to perform this duty can be sold, bargained away, under any circumstances, as if it were a mere privilege which the legislator could dispose of at his pleasure. This principle has been asserted and repeated in this court in the last few years in no ambiguous terms. The first time it seems to have been distinctly and clearly presented was in the case of Boyd v. Alabama, 94 U.S. 646.

> 'Whatever differences of opinion,' said the court, [in the case of Beer Co. v. Massachusetts, 97 U.S. 28] 'may exist as to the extent and boundaries of the police power, and however difficult it may be to render a satisfactory definition of it, there seems to be no doubt that it does extend to the protection of the lives, health, and property of the citizens, and to the preservation of good order and public morals. The legislature cannot by any contract divest itself of the power to provide for these objects. They belong emphatically to that class of objects which demand the application of the maxim, salus populi suprema lex, and they are to be attained and provided for by such appropriate means as the legislative discretion may devise. That discretion can no more be bargained away than the power itself.'

> ... In the still more recent case of Stone v. Mississippi, 101 U.S. 814, the whole subject is reviewed in the opinion delivered [111 U.S. 746, 753] by the chief justice. That also was a case of a chartered lottery, whose charter was repealed by a constitution of the state subsequently adopted. It came here for relief, relying on the clause of the federal constitution against impairing the obligation of contracts. The question is therefore presented, (says the opinion,) whether, in view of these facts, the legislature of a state can, by the charter of a lottery company, defeat the will of the people authoritatively expressed, in relation to the further continuance of such business in their midst. We think it cannot. No legislature can bargain away the public health or the public morals. The people themselves cannot do it, much less their servants. The supervision of both these subjects of governmental power is continuing in its nature, and they are to be dealt with as the special exigencies of the moment may require. Government is organized with a view to their preservation, and cannot divest itself of the power to provide for them. For this purpose the legislative discretion is allowed, and the discretion cannot be parted with any more than the power itself."  

[Butchers' Union Co. v. Crescent City Co., 111 U.S. 746 (1884)]

The above case is not specifically about the Federal Reserve, but it helps illustrate the point we are trying to make. The point is that when the Congress delegated the powers of the Treasury to manage the U.S. Bank to the Federal Reserve with the
passage of the Federal Reserve Act in 1913, they in effect created a private, for-profit monopoly over our money system that was delegated to a private corporation. This private corporation, the Federal Reserve, wields enormous power and certainly affects public (emotional) health and morals. The absence of a stable monetary system can wreak havoc and destroy a country with even greater force than any war ever could, which means that control over our banking system can be far more important and influential to public health and safety and morals than the far more limited issues discussed in the above case. Yet, in the above case, the court would not allow a government to delegate the power to regulate aspects of the public health to private corporations. For the same reason, the U.S. Congress should not have and cannot lawfully delegate to a private, for-profit corporation, the responsibility of the U.S. Government to regulate the value or our money. The scoundrels who did this should be tried for treason.

2.8.10.3 Federal Reserve Never Audited

The fed has never to this day been audited by the General Accounting Office. Why not? Because Congress doesn’t have the power to audit it, and they know it.

In July 1996, a Senate oversight committee chaired by Alphonse D’Amato examined the Federal Reserve System for the first time, noting a few discrepancies but totally avoiding and ignoring any meaningful examination of the fiat creation of our money.

The National Educator in its August-September 1996 issue states:

> At the request of two U.S. Senators, the government Accounting Office has just completed a study of the Federal Reserve System...the revealing study explains that the reason the Fed was created was ‘to furnish an elastic currency’, so that, in essence, the value of the money can be changed. This defrauds the American people just as deliberately as if the government changed a foot to ten inches or a pound to fourteen ounces. When a businessman deliberately cheats his customers, he is called a criminal. Not so with the network of power inside brokers who use the Federal Reserve Banks to inflate the dollar with elastic currency.

> For example, a $20,000 wage earner in 1980 would have had to earn $34,000 in 1990 just to stay even. In just the last six years, the Federal Reserve Note has lost approximately 20 percent of its purchasing power.

> The GAO report states that the Federal Reserve Banks are not owned by the federal government as many Americans believe but are actually owned by privately held banks and a few wealthy individuals. According to the GAO reports, the Fed profits go to the privately held banks. In 1993, at our request, a senior congressional staffer made an official request to House Banking Committee Chairman Henry Gonzalez’s office for a current list of the Class A stockholders of the Fed Banks. His office refused to supply the list of owners and implied that asking for such information was dangerous.

2.8.11 Debt

> "Owe no one anything except to love one another, for he who loves another has fulfilled the law."

[Romans 13:8, Bible, NKJV]

People, businesses, and countries with debts become slaves of their debts and to the lender. Here is the scripture that verifies this:

> "The rich ruleth over the poor, and the borrower [is] servant to the lender."

[Prov. 22:7, Bible, NKJV]

The lender above, in the case of our federal government, is the private corporation known as the Federal Reserve. By becoming irresponsible in perpetually borrowing money to pay off its regular bills, our federal government has surrendered its sovereignty to the banksters. These same corrupted politicians who are surrendering our sovereignty and borrowing us deeper into the hole continually passed a Constitutional Amendment that says you have no right to question the debts they run up, but are obligated to pay them no matter what! Here it is, from Section 4 of the Fourteenth Amendment, which incidentally the southern states were FORCED to ratify at gun point while they were occupied by hostile northern forces during our civil war:

---

17 Losing Your Illusions, Gordon Phillips, p. 50.
Why is debt bad? When there are payments on debts that need to be made, then we often aren’t able to meet our immediate obligations, especially if the payments or interest rates are excessive. Politicians like debt as a tool for political leverage because if they can put our country into a financial crisis or emergency by running up the debt, they can justify all kinds of unethical tactics that violate many different laws and Constitutional rights in the name of that crisis or emergency. Our whole civil framework goes out the window when there are national emergencies (read the War Powers Act of December 18, 1941, if you want more information about this, for instance), and yet a great many citizens are blissfully unaware of this fact because they have never been through a crisis situation. If you doubt this, go on the Internet and read some of the President’s Executive Orders for cases of emergency and national crisis. A financial crisis caused by debt is the #1 vehicle or excuse politicians will use to create the “New World Order” in the coming years. The Federal Reserve, we predict, will be the vehicle used to institute the next depression. Recall that it was the first Great Depression which caused the people to be so willing to give up their rights and liberties for a socialistic government handout in the form of Social Security. The idea of “buying votes” using welfare and socialist security (socialism, in effect) was what caused President Roosevelt to be reelected three times in a row! This tactic, by the way, is ILLEGAL under 18 U.S.C. §597 entitled “Expenditures to influence voting”. Why wasn’t Roosevelt prosecuted for this?

One of the frequent vehicles that politicians use to argue that we need to continue paying voluntary federal income taxes is the idea that we have all this federal debt that needs to be paid off, and that the debt keeps growing rather than shrinking. They will state that if we don’t continue paying, then the credit rating of the United States would be ruined. If ruining the credit rating of the United States is the only way to get our national leaders to be fiscally responsible, then it can’t happen soon enough, as far as we are concerned, because it concerns us deeply that in a time of peace with no major wars going on, we continue to run up the national debt because that debt is a threat to our national sovereignty and our individual liberties.

Of course, these same politicians will never talk instead about the urgency of keeping the federal budget balanced so we don’t chronically have to borrow to fund our annual expenditures, and they will oppose balanced budget amendments over the objections of the vast majority of citizens. Their concept of paying off the debt is to inflate it away by printing more money, rather than taking the non-inflationary and fiscally responsible approach of simply paying it off.

For those of you who are Christians, we’d like to remind you of the following scriptures, which clearly say that borrowing is wrong because it is slavery, and that if you loan you should not charge interest to your brother but you can do so of a foreigner:

“For the Lord your God will bless you just as He promised you; you shall lend to many nations, but you shall not borrow; you shall reign over many nations, but they shall not reign over you.”
[Deut. 15:6, Bible, NKJV]

“The Lord will open to you His good treasure, the heavens, to give the rain to your land in its season, and to bless all the work of your hand. You shall lend to many nations, but you shall not borrow.”
[Deut. 28:12, Bible, NKJV]

“You shall not charge interest to your brother--interest on money or food or anything that is lent out at interest.”
[Deut. 23:19, Bible, NKJV]

“To a foreigner you may charge interest, but to your brother you shall not charge interest, that the Lord your God may bless you in all to which you set your hand in the land which you are entering to possess.”
[Deut. 23:20, Bible, NKJV]

Who are we in debt to? The Federal Reserve. In the context of the above, who is the Federal Reserve? They are FOREIGNERS. The federal courts have ruled that the Federal Reserve is not part of the U.S. government. Our own government is putting us into debt and slavery to foreigners, and because they are foreigners, they can charge interest according to the above scriptures. We contend that the Federal Reserve ought to be a part of the U.S. government, and not a private, for-profit corporation.

The debt that our politicians have put us in only incentivizes our government to violate our rights to make payments on the debt and perpetually raise our income taxes to pay for debts caused by their lack of ability to balance the federal budget and chronically deficits spend. It ought to be clear that politicians, by advocating chronic and growing public debt, are violating...
the above scriptures and being irresponsible in their public office. They are advocating loaning to our brother at interest and that debt becomes a tool for political leverage to be used to cause us to surrender our sovereign rights to the government and turn us all into slaves and servants of the politicians and the Federal Reserve. Thomas Jefferson put it very well in describing the evils of public debt:

"I sincerely believe... that banking establishments are more dangerous than standing armies, and that the principle of spending money to be paid by posterity under the name of funding is but swindling futurity on a large scale."
[Thomas Jefferson to John Taylor, 1816. ME 15:23]

"Funding I consider as limited, rightfully, to a redemption of the debt within the lives of a majority of the generation contracting it; every generation coming equally, by the laws of the Creator of the world, to the free possession of the earth He made for their subsistence, unencumbered by their predecessors, who, like them, were but tenants for life."
[Thomas Jefferson to John Taylor, 1816. ME 15:18]

"The natural right to be free of the debts of a previous generation is a salutary curb on the spirit of war and indebtedment, which, since the modern theory of the perpetuation of debt, has drenched the earth with blood, and crushed its inhabitants under burdens ever accumulating."
[Thomas Jefferson to John Wayles Eppes, 1813. ME 13:272]

"We believe—or we act as if we believed—that although an individual father cannot alienate the labor of his son, the aggregate body of fathers may alienate the labor of all their sons, of their posterity, in the aggregate, and oblige them to pay for all the enterprises, just or unjust, profitable or ruinous, into which our vices, our passions or our personal interests may lead us. But I trust that this proposition needs only to be looked at by an American to be seen in its true point of view, and that we shall all consider ourselves unauthorized to saddle posterity with our debts, and morally bound to pay them ourselves; and consequently within what may be deemed the period of a generation, or the life of the majority."
[Thomas Jefferson to John Wayles Eppes, 1813. ME 13:357]

"It is incumbent on every generation to pay its own debts as it goes. A principle which if acted on would save one-half the wars of the world."
[Thomas Jefferson to A. L. C. Destutt de Tracy, 1820. FE 10:175]

To preserve [the] independence [of the people,] we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts as that we must be taxed in our meat and in our drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and our amusements, for our callings and our creeds, as the people of England are, our people, like them, must come to labor sixteen hours in the twenty-four, give the earnings of fifteen of these to the government for their debts and daily expenses, and the sixteenth being insufficient to afford us bread, we must live, as they now do, on oatmeal and potatoes, have no time to think, no means of calling the mismanagers to account, but be glad to obtain subsistence by hiring ourselves to rivet their chains on the necks of our fellow-sufferers."
[Thomas Jefferson to Samuel Kercheval, 1816. ME 15:39]

The Bible also condemns "surety", which means that we aren’t allowed to be a cosigner for our friend or family member. Here is the definition of surety:

"Surety. One who at the request of another, and for the purpose of securing to him a benefit, becomes responsible for the performance by the latter of some act in favor of a third person, or hypothecates property as security therefore. One who undertakes to pay money or to do any other act in event that his principal fails therein. A person who is primarily liable for payment of debt or performance of obligation of another."

Below is some biblical wisdom about surety:

"A man devoid of understanding shakes hands in a pledge, and becomes surety for his friend."
[Proverbs 17:18, Bible, NKJV]

"He who is surety for a stranger will suffer, but one who hates being surety is secure."
[Prov. 11:15, NKJV]

When we have committed the sin and the mistake of becoming surety for anyone, the Bible emphatically tells us what we must do in no uncertain terms:

"My son, if you become surety for your friend, if you have shaken hands in pledge for a stranger, you are snared by the words of your mouth; you are taken by the words of your mouth. So do this, my son, and deliver yourself;"
So the Bible describes those who loan money, which in this case is the Federal Reserve, as a “hunter”. A more modern term is a “predator”! Our national debt to the private corporation called the Federal Reserve has made us surety and collateral for our friend, or in this case, our fellow citizens and politicians. The Bible says we have an obligation to eliminate this surety as quickly as we can and to not sleep until it has been eliminated! Why? Because our lives will be consumed with anxiety about meeting the debt obligation so that we may not focus on the things of the Lord or on our responsibilities to our families. It will also cloud our judgment and cause us to lose our objectivity. If we lose our job or our income source and are unable to replace it, our whole world will come crashing down around us! The security of our entire family will consequently be threatened and we are told in no uncertain terms in the Bible by God that we cannot permit this:

> "But if anyone does not provide for his own, and especially for those of his own household, he has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever."

[1 Tim. 5:8, Bible, KJV]

When we either load ourselves with debt or we become surety for our friend, then we have in effect become citizens of Babylon, the worldly cosmopolitan city ruled by Satan which the Bible describes in Revelation as “The Great Harlot”. Have you prostituted yourself to “mammon”, “sex”, “money”, or “debt” or the cares of the world, and ignored your spiritual obligations to the Lord? This is idolatry and violates the first commandment to put God first in your life. Revelation 18:1-8 confirms that a great and sudden disaster will destroy this city like what happened to Sodom and Gomorrah, and we predict the disaster will happen because this “city” will be deep in debt and when the business climate is disrupted, the whole big mess will implode on itself:

> After these things I saw another angel coming down from heaven, having great authority, and the earth was illuminated with his glory.

And he cried mightily with a loud voice saying, 'Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and has become a dwelling place of demons, a prison for every foul spirit, and a cage for every unclean and hated bird!'

> "For all the nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, the kings [politicians, who load us with debt] of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth have become rich through the abundance of her luxury."

And I heard another voice from heaven saying, ‘Come out of her, my people, lest you share in her sins, and lest you receive her plagues.

> "For her sins have reached to heaven, and God has remembered her iniquities."

> "Render to her just as she rendered to you, and repay her double according to her works; in the cup which she has mixed, mix double for her.

> "In the measure that she glorified herself and lived luxuriously, in the same measure give her torment and sorrow; for she says in her heart, 'I sit as queen, and am no widow, and will not see sorrow.'

> "Therefore her plagues [economic or stock market collapses] will come in one day—death and mourning and famine. And she will be utterly burned with fire [looting from all the greedy people who mortgaged themselves to the hilt and put their children into debt slavery to pay for their luxuries], for strong is the Lord God who judges her."

So Jesus is saying we should flee this city and pursue Christian liberty to serve our God instead of the false gods of money, sex, power, career, and new age philosophy. We must get ourselves out of debt and free from surety as quickly as possible or we are in peril of being destroyed when Babylon is destroyed! This means that we cannot be

2.8.12 Surrendering Freedoms in the Name of “Government-Induced Crises"

> "Necessity is the plea for every infringement of human freedom. It is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves."

[William Pitt, 18 Nov 1783]
Most of the damage to our constitutional liberties and freedoms over the years came during the early 1900’s, and most of this damage was done in the name of one or another type of financial emergency or global conflict induced directly or indirectly by the government, which gave the government the authority to ask citizens to give up their constitutional liberties as a patriotic duty to save the country. For instance:

1. The Federal Reserve was instituted in 1913, the same year that the 16th Amendment was fraudulently ratified. Very shortly thereafter, there was a massive and deliberate contraction of the money supply by the Federal Reserve, which quickly precipitated the Great Depression of 1929. As a consequence of this crisis, Franklin D. Roosevelt outlawed holding gold and demanded that all citizens turn in all of their gold to the government at a government mandated price. Prior to that, we had been on the gold standard, where all of our currency was backed by gold held in Fort Knox, and could be redeemed directly for value in gold. This, of course, was just a trick to force everyone to accept paper money, which further expanded the power of the government, because the Department of the Treasury was the only organization in the country that could print this money. Once the government could get people using paper money, they could manufacture money out of thin air and deficit spend like crazy by printing more money! They could also use the money they printed to buy votes in favor of more socialism by instituting welfare and entitlement programs that would endear people to the expansion of government programs and the eventual income taxes needed to pay for them.

2. In the midst of the Great Depression starting in 1929, when people were watching their family members starving and suffering and out of work, the government stepped in again in 1935 with the Social Security program, which was “voluntary”. You had to apply for a “number” to enroll. To keep the courts from fighting against his social reforms, Franklin D. Roosevelt stacked the Supreme Court, which is to say that he doubled its size with his own set of “cronies” so that no challenges to his social programs in court would win. He knew he could get away with this supposedly because the constitution didn’t specify how many justices were on the Supreme Court. The majority of people were suffering with the depression so most people were willing to go in and get a Social Security Number so they could get a free handout from the government at a time when they needed it most. Of course, the government never would have been able to afford to give everyone this kind of handout if they hadn’t eliminated gold and forced everyone to accept paper money only a few years earlier at the start of the Great Depression. The expansion of government power at this time in American history was unprecedented.

3. During World War II, the U.S. Congress instituted a voluntary income tax called the “Victory Tax”, which incidentally still is mentioned to this day in the Internal Revenue Code (26 U.S. Code). People were told by the government that it was their patriotic duty to pay income taxes to finance the war. The tax was intended to finance the war, and included employer withholding participation. This tax was the precursor to the income tax we have today. Unfortunately, the tax was repealed after the war but citizens were never told about it. Why?.. because we had to pay off the war debt! Our country has remained in perpetual debt ever since, presumably as a justification for continuing the income tax! As long as Congress continues to deficit spend in a time of peace and not focus on paying down the national debt, then there will always be a justification for demagoguery about why we need to continue the income tax.

4. Congress passed a bill called the War Powers Act in December 18, 1941, which gives them the right to do virtually anything they want with you or your property in the name of defending the country. It was instituted during World War II.

5. The President of the United States is authorized to execute Executive Orders. Every new president who comes along adds to the long list of Executive Orders already in place. Very seldom are these orders ever repealed. Have you ever looked through the long series of executive orders signed by each president that even to this day are still in effect? Reading these orders is truly frightening! Many of them list what happens mainly during national emergencies. It is of great concern reading these orders to think just how many of our freedoms can be taken away very easily and quickly in the event of national emergencies!

2.8.13 Judicial Tyranny

Judicial tyranny is what allows corruption in the government to flourish and grow, because judicial tyranny protects wrongdoing by public servants throughout the government. Judicial tyranny is the most pervasive and necessary type of tyranny in order for tyranny elsewhere in the government to exist because:
1. It protects judges from being prosecuted for treason and conspiracy against rights by persons who have been injured by government wrongdoing.
2. It facilitates the official cover-up of government wrongdoing by using protective orders, nonpublication of cases, and suppression of incriminating evidence against government wrongdoing.
3. It screens juries to ensure only biased jurists hear cases and rule in the government’s favor, when there is a jury trial.
4. Allows corrupt judges to dismiss cases before they are heard, so that discovery of the wrongdoing can never occur.
5. Courts punish and persecute attorneys who try to prosece government officials or agencies for wrongdoing by pulling their license to practice law.
6. Courts cannot pull licenses of pro per litigants. They will frequently but illegally penalize them under Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for “frivolous pleadings” or they also grant motions to strike pleadings by the government so that pro per litigants are left with nothing to argue.

The above types of evil are the worst types of tyranny found anywhere in the government, because the collective net effect of them has a very repressive effect on society. Thomas Jefferson warned us that our federal judiciary would get out of control when he made the following statements about the federal judiciary:

“Contrary to all correct example, [the Federal judiciary] are in the habit of going out of the question before them, to throw an anchor ahead and grapple further hold for future advances of power. They are then in fact the corps of sappers and miners, steadily working to undermine the independent rights of the States and to consolidate all power in the hands of that government in which they have so important a freehold estate.”

[Thomas Jefferson: Autobiography, 1821. ME 1:121]

“We all know that permanent judges acquire an esprit de corps; that, being known, they are liable to be tempted by bribery; that they are misled by favor, by relationship, by a spirit of party, by a devotion to the executive or legislative: that it is better to leave a cause to the decision of cross and pile than to that of a judge biased to one side; and that the opinion of twelve honest jurors gives still a better hope of right than cross and pile does.”

[Thomas Jefferson to Abbe Arnoux, 1789. ME 7:423, Papers 15:283]

“It is not enough that honest men are appointed judges. All know the influence of interest on the mind of man, and how unconsciously his judgment is warped by that influence. To this bias add that of the esprit de corps, of their peculiar maxim and creed that “it is the office of a good judge to enlarge his jurisdiction,” and the absence of responsibility, and how can we expect impartial decision between the General government, of which they are themselves so eminent a part, and an individual state from which they have nothing to hope or fear?”

[Thomas Jefferson: Autobiography, 1821. ME 1:121]

“At the establishment of our Constitutions, the judiciary bodies were supposed to be the most helpless and harmless members of the government. Experience, however, soon showed in what way they were to become the most dangerous; that the insufficiency of the means provided for their removal gave them a freehold and irresponsibility in office; that their decisions, seeming to concern individual suitors only, pass silent and unheeded by the public at large; that these decisions nevertheless become law by precedent, sapping by little and little the foundations of the Constitution and working its change by construction before any one has perceived that that invisible and helpless worm has been busily employed in consuming its substance. In truth, man is not made to be trusted for life if secured against all liability to account.”

[Thomas Jefferson to A. Coray, 1823. ME 15:486]

“I do not charge the judges with willful and ill-intentioned error; but honest error must be arrested where its toleration leads to public ruin. As for the safety of society, we commit honest maniacs to Bedlam; so judges should be withdrawn from their bench whose erroneous biases are leading us to dissolution. It may, indeed, injure them in fame or in fortune; but it saves the republic, which is the first and supreme law.”

[Thomas Jefferson: Autobiography, 1821. ME 1:122]

“The original error was in establishing a judiciary independent of the nation, and which, from the citadel of the law, can turn its guns on those they were meant to defend, and control and fashion their proceedings to its own will.”

[Thomas Jefferson to John Wayles Eppes, 1807. FE 9:68]

“It is a misnomer to call a government republican in which a branch of the supreme power [the Federal Judiciary] is independent of the nation.”

[Thomas Jefferson to James Pleasants, 1821. FE 10:198]

“It is left... to the juries, if they think the permanent judges are under any bias whatever in any case, to take on themselves to judge the law as well as the fact. They never exercise this power but when they suspect partiality in the judges; and by the exercise of this power they have been the firmest bulwarks of English liberty.”

[Thomas Jefferson to Abbe Arnoux, 1789. ME 7:423, Papers 15:283]
Very wise words indeed! Thomas Jefferson’s warnings and predictions above were prophetic, because today we have a federal judiciary that is completely out of control with respect to income tax matters, which happens to be the area of law possessing the greatest conflict of interest universally for all federal judges, as we will explain.

We’ll now examine in greater detail how judicial tyranny is perpetrated and expanded in today’s federal courts to show just how far the tyranny predicted by Jefferson has taken us. The abuses and usurpations of power are very numerous but carefully concealed by most judges so that they are out of public view. Collectively, these usurpations constitute a massive conspiracy against the rights of the sovereign people that is a treasonable offense, and they also explain why:

“Absolute power corrupts absolutely.”

and why the founding fathers went to such extensive means to separate sovereign powers in our government to prevent corruption and conspiracy of the kind that is commonplace today. As you read through the following subsections and witness all the antics and corruption of our judiciary, compare this with what God in His sovereignty requires of these same judges in the following scripture:

Psalm 82 [Amplified Bible]
A Psalm of Asaph.

1 GOD STANDS in the assembly [of the representatives] of God; in the midst of the magistrates or judges He gives judgment [as] among the gods.

2 How long will you [magistrates or judges] judge unjustly and show partiality to the wicked? Selah [pause, and calmly think of that]!

3 Do justice to the weak (poor) and fatherless; maintain the rights of the afflicted and needy.

4 Deliver the poor and needy; rescue them out of the hand of the wicked.

5 [The magistrates and judges] know not, neither will they understand; they walk on in the darkness [of complacent satisfaction]; all the foundations of the earth [the fundamental principles upon which rests the administration of justice] are shaking.

6 I said, You are gods [since you judge on My behalf, as My representatives]; indeed, all of you are children of the Most High,(1) but you shall die as men and fall as one of the princes.

8 Arise, O God, judge the earth! For to You belong all the nations.(19)

After you have read this scripture, pray about it and then ask yourself the following questions:

- What can we do to punish these tyrants?
- How can we reform our corrupted system to eliminate or at least reduce such abuses?
- How can we eliminate the inherent conflict of interest that exists because judges are paid by the income tax and are beholden to the IRS if they rule against it?

Also consider that the answer cannot rely on the judges or the legal profession they come from, because they have already demonstrated that they can’t be trusted and have become corrupted, mostly by the love of money.

2.8.13.1 Conflict of Interest and Bias of Federal Judges

“The king establishes the land by justice, but he who receives bribes overthrows it.”
[Prov. 29:4, Bible, NKJV]
Federal law prohibits conflict of interest or bias on the part of judges as follows:

1. **28 U.S.C. §144**: Bias or prejudice of judge
2. **28 U.S.C. §455**: Disqualification of justice, judge, or magistrate judge

If you would like to learn what the courts think of the use of these statutes against judges, look at the link below on our website:

http://famguardian.org/PublishedAuthors/Govt/FJC/Recusal.pdf

When judges possess a conflict of interest, they are more likely to judge unrighteously and in favor of their selfish interest over and above the interests of justice. Below are some of the more prevalent sources of conflicts of interest:

1. Many judges believe that their pay or benefits are derived from income taxes and that if they rule against the income tax, they will harm their employer and jeopardize future pay increases. Article III, Section I of the Constitution prevents the salaries of judges from being reduced while in office, but their future pay increases can be reduced.
2. When a judge rules against the government’s interest too often, one of two things will happen to them:
   2.1. They will be removed from office for bad behavior under 28 U.S.C. §44(b).
   2.2. The Department of Justice will frame the judge so that he gets removed from office. There are many examples of this happening to judges, and one example is mentioned in the We The People Truth in Taxation hearings in which a judge was framed, according to Attorney Larry Becraft.
   2.3. They will be threatened with an IRS audit or collection action unless they cooperate. Remember that the IRS is part of the Executive branch of the government and performs a function delegated from Congress to collect taxes. The ability of the Executive branch to influence or coerce members of the judiciary using the power of the IRS becomes a financial terrorism vehicle that few judges will resist.

   “In the general course of human nature, A POWER OVER A MAN’s SUBSISTENCE AMOUNTS TO A POWER OVER HIS WILL.”
   [Alexander Hamilton, The Federalist, No. 79]

   Furthermore, it is a well established precedent that a judge whose salary can be diminished by legislation or who holds office for other than a lifetime cannot be an Article III judge who can rule on the rights or status of a person in the Union states. He can only rule on Article I or Article IV issues relating to the federal zone.
3. Most judges were lawyers at one time. In many cases, they were federal prosecutors and they have college buddies who are in private practice who they may feel inclined to help. Because of this, they are inclined to want to protect and rule in favor of their former coworker attorneys in the Department of Justice.
4. The more litigation there is, the more prosperous it is for lawyers. One way to increase litigation is to increase injustice in the courts or to rule excessively in favor of the government, so that citizens litigating against government corruption will want to appeal to the circuit courts and run up even more legal fees. This means lawyers will make more money and the legal profession will need more lawyers, and what lawyer, whether a judge or not, wouldn’t want that? Therefore, judges who were once lawyers will be inclined to want to benefit their profession and expand its power and totalitarian control and economic power over our government and the people. They do this through:
   4.1. Ruling in favor of the government when it would be unjust.
   4.2. Punishing litigants who practice law without a license granted by them.
5. We mentioned earlier in section 2.8.11 that the federal government is in deep debt and that the goal of our politicians is to spend us into a deep hole and put us into massive debt slavery to the privately owned Federal Reserve. We also mentioned that the Bible says this creates a conflict of interest:

   “The rich ruleth over the poor, and the borrower [is] servant to the lender.”
   [Prov. 22:7, Bible, NKJV]

   Federal judges know that if they rule against the illegal enforcement of Internal Revenue Code and thereby reduce federal revenues, they may threaten the solvency of their employer and cause bankruptcy, civil unrest, and chaos in our society. By doing so, they compromise the integrity of the federal judiciary today to prevent the inevitable collapse of the communist system later.
6. Judges know that pro per or pro se litigants are the most dangerous types of litigants because they: 1. Do not economically benefit the legal profession by doing all their own litigation; 2. Have a potential to clog the courts for years because
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there are far more of them then there are lawyers; 3. Are more likely to bring up issues that will embarrass the government because they have no license they could lose and can be more independent and objective than most attorneys. Therefore, judges have a vested interest in sanctioning and penalizing pro per litigants in order to maintain their iron fist control over the courtroom and to ensure that only attorneys THEY license can appear in court, and these attorneys will always litigate in favor of the government or have their license pulled to practice law and starve to death. Tyranny.

All of the above conflicts of interest create severe biases and prejudices against justice in federal courtrooms all over the country and explain the irrational, tyrannical rulings relating to income tax that are so prevalent. Irwin Schiff, as a matter of fact, is famous for saying “More crimes occur in federal courtrooms every day than anywhere else in the country!” and we believe he is right. The only way to eliminate these conflicts of interest completely is:

1. Eliminate the requirement for jurors to be “U.S. citizens”, because this creates a bias and prejudice against those who are “nationals” ONLY because the juries are not juries of peers.
2. Require jury trials for all tax matters so that judges don’t have to decide the case. Currently, jury trials are optional but not mandatory under 28 U.S.C. §2402.
3. Eliminate attorney licensing. This is a scam that does nothing but undermine our First Amendment rights of freedom of speech and our right to contract under Article I, Section 10 of the U.S. Constitution.
4. Eliminate the ability to sanction pro per litigants under Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
5. Repudiate the national debt and make it illegal for our Congressmen to borrow more money except with the consent of the voters and a three fourths vote by the Congress.
6. Make judges directly accountable to the people they serve by making them elected by the people in their district rather than appointed by the President. This is the focus of the Judicial Accountability Initiative Law (J.A.I.L.), which you can read about at http://www.jail4judges.org/.

2.8.13.2 Sovereign and Official Immunity

Sovereign immunity is defined in Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, page 1396 as follows:

Sovereign immunity. A judicial doctrine which precludes bringing suit against the government without its consent. Founded on the ancient principle that “the King can do no wrong,” it bars holding the government or its political subdivisions liable for the torts of its officers or agents unless such immunity is expressly waived by statute or by necessary inference from legislative enactment. Maryland Port Admin. V. I.T.O. Corp. Of Baltimore, 40 Md.App. 697, 395 A.2d. 145, 149. The federal government has generally waived its non-tort action immunity in the Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C.A. §1346(a)(2), 1491, and its tort immunity in the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C.A. §1346(b), 2674. Most states have also waived immunity in various degrees at both the state and local government levels.

The immunity from certain suits in federal court rationed to states by the Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution.

This sounds reasonable on the surface, but remember that the government is NOT the king in our system of government, which is a republican democracy founded on individual rights. The PEOPLE are the sovereigns and the king, and the government exists and acts on their behalf as a fiduciary. The contract which limits and defines the powers of government officers as fiduciaries is the Constitution. We discussed the subject of fiduciary duty of individual government employees in detail earlier in section 2.1. The supreme Court also agreed with the conclusion that the people are the sovereigns and the government servants are fiduciaries in the case of Yick Wo v. Hopkins in 1886:

“[W]hen we consider the nature and the theory of our institutions of government, the principles on which they are supposed to rest, and review the history of their development, we are constrained to conclude that they do not mean to leave room for the play and action of purely personal and arbitrary power. Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts. And the law is the definition and limitation of power. It is, indeed, quite true that there must always be lodged somewhere, and in some person or body, the authority of final decision; and in many cases of mere administration, the responsibility is purely political, no appeal lying except to the ultimate tribunal of the public judgment, exercised either in the pressure of opinion, or by means of the suffrage. But the fundamental rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, considered as individual possessions, are secured by those maxims of constitutional law which are the monuments showing the victorious progress of the race in securing to men the blessings of civilization under the reign of just and equal laws, so that, in the famous language of the Massachusetts bill of rights, the government of the commonwealth ‘may be a government of laws and not of men.’ For the very idea that one man may be compelled to hold his life, or the means of living, or any material
right essential to the enjoyment of life, at the mere will of another, seems to be intolerable in any country where freedom prevails, as being the essence of slavery itself.” 
[Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356 (1886)]

And in 1884, the supreme Court repeated this doctrine again:

“There is no such thing as a power of inherent sovereignty in the government of the United States. In this country sovereignty resides in the people, and Congress can exercise no power which they have not, by their Constitution entrusted to it. All else is withheld.”
[Juilliard v. Greenman, 110 U.S. 421 (1884)]

Therefore, THE PEOPLE are the ones who should have sovereign immunity, and not the government but tyrannical judges try to twist this around for their personal benefit. It ought to be obvious, though, that the doctrine of sovereign immunity competes directly with the goal of the written social contract called the Constitution, which is to define and limit the delegated powers of government officers acting as fiduciaries of the people. The officers individually may be tried for their torts (injurious actions) if they are acting outside of their lawful delegated authority and so may the government they work for under the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C.A. §1346(b). Here is the way one court described it:

“The doctrine of sovereign immunity, raised by defendants, is inapplicable since plaintiffs contend that the defendants’ action were beyond the scope of their authority or they were acting unconstitutionally.”

However, in many cases, federal judges often will try assert sovereign immunity anyway or they will allow or encourage the government to substitute the United States as defendant when an injured party tries to civilly prosecute an individual government employee who was acting illegally. This, of course, violates common sense and principles of equity but happens quite often. When it does happen, the supreme Court says it amounts to communism!:

“...the maxim that the King can do no wrong has no place in our system of government; yet it is also true, in respect to the State itself, that whatever wrong is attempted in its name is imputable to its government and not to the State, for, as it can speak and act only by law, whatever it does say and do must be lawful. That which therefore is unlawful because made so by the supreme law, the Constitution of the United States, is not the word or deed of the State, but is the mere wrong and trespass of those individual persons who falsely spread and act in its name.”

“This distinction is essential to the idea of constitutional government. To deny it or blot it out obliterates the line of demarcation that separates constitutional government from absolutism, free self-government based on the sovereignty of the people from that despotism, whatever of the one or the many, which enables the agent of the state to declare and decree that he is the state; to say ‘L’Etat, c’est moi.’ Of what avail are written constitutions, whose bills of right, for the security of individual liberty, have been written too often with the blood of martyrs shed upon the battle-field and the scaffold, if their limitations and restraints upon power may be overpassed with impunity by the very agencies created and appointed to guard, defend, and enforce them; and that, too, with the sacred authority of law, not only compelling obedience, but entitled to respect? And how else can these principles of individual liberty and right be maintained, if, when violated, the judicial tribunals are forbidden to visit penalties upon individual offenders, who are the instruments of wrong, whenever they interpose the shield of the state? The doctrine is not to be tolerated. The whole frame and scheme of the political institutions of this country, state and federal, protest against it. Their continued existence is not compatible with it. It is the doctrine of absolutism, pure, simple, and naked, and of communism which is its twin, the double progeny of the same evil birth.”
[Poindexter v. Greenhow, 114 U.S. 270, 5 S.Ct. 903 (1885)]

Even so, it isn’t unusual when a lower court such as a district or circuit court abuses a litigant by abusing sovereign immunity that when the case is appealed, the supreme Court in effect sanctions and encourages the abuse by refusing to hear the appeal or grant the case a writ of certiorari. The sin in such a case becomes an act of omission rather than commission, but it is still a sin and a wrong by any moral standard. All of this explains a rather wise comment one of our colleagues made when he said about man’s law (rather than God’s law):

“The first casualty of man’s law is always truth and justice.”

A related type of abuse occurs when the court asserts “official immunity”*, the purpose of which is to insulate from liability a government employee for acts done while in office, even if those acts are injurious and unlawful. We discuss this subject further in section 6.6.3.
2.8.13.3 Cases Tried Without Jury

Another cruel abuse that tyrannical judges impose in the courtroom is to eliminate the use of juries when it is being prosecuted civilly and is the defendant, even though the intent of the Seventh Amendment was to guarantee a jury trial for any matter over $20. We talk about this kind of abuse later in section 6.9.2, where we say that the federal courts stole your right to a trial by jury. This is hypocrisy at its finest and the most blatant conflict of interest imaginable: putting a single judge in charge of ruling or deciding whether he should bite the hand that feeds him, which is his government employer, by ruling against it. What do you think he is going to do, especially if this very same hand that feeds him can have him removed from office for bad behavior (28 U.S.C. §134(a)), blacklisted, and framed by false witnesses who were secretly pressured by the DOJ and FBI? This is what the government often does to judges and even Congressmen who are honest about the fraud of the income tax. Case in point is what happened to Congressmen James Traficant from Ohio. We have the complete docket of pleadings for his case posted on our website at:

http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/CaseStudies/JamesTraficant/JamesTraficant.htm

Here is the way one corrupt judge unethically and immorally wiggled out of the requirement for jury trials with the government as defendant:

Taxpayers also assert they were denied their Seventh Amendment right to trial by jury before the Tax Court. The Seventh Amendment preserves the right to jury trial "in suits at common law." Since there was no right of action at common law against a sovereign, enforceable by jury trial or otherwise, there is no constitutional right to a jury trial in a suit against the United States. See 9 C. Wright & A. Miller, Federal Practice & Procedure § 2314, at 68-69 (1971). Thus, there is a right to a jury trial in actions against the United States only if a statute so provides. Congress has not so provided when the taxpayer elects not to pay the assessment and sue for a redetermination in the Tax Court. For a taxpayer to obtain a trial by jury, he must pay the tax allegedly owed and sue for a refund in district court. 28 U.S.C. §§ 2402 and 1346(a)(1). The law is therefore clear that a taxpayer who elects to bring his suit in the Tax Court has no right, statutory or constitutional, to a trial by jury. Phillips v. Commissioner, 283 U.S. 589, 599 n. 9, 51 S.Ct. 608, 75 L.Ed. 1289 (1931); Wickwire v. Reinecke, 275 U.S. 101, 105-106, 48 S.Ct. 43, 72 L.Ed. 184 (1927); Dorl v. Commissioner, 507 F.2d. 406, 407 (2d Cir. 1974) (holding it "elementary that there is no right to a jury trial in the Tax Court."). [Mathes v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 576 F.2d. 70 (1978)]

The above ruling does nothing but encourage irresponsibility and hypocrisy in our own government, and takes government employees out of their role as servants and fiduciaries of the sovereign people and makes them into communist tyrants, to use the words of the supreme Court, who can’t be called to account for their wrongs. Treason! By natural law, the judge that made the above ruling deserves to be executed under Article III of the Constitution.

2.8.13.4 Attorney Licensing

Another area of massive conflict of interest in the courtroom that promotes injustice is the notion of attorney licensing by the same court that hears cases by the licensed attorney. What do you think a judge is going to do if the attorney that the court licensed brings a civil suit against the government or a government officer? They are going to pull his license to practice law or at least threaten to pull it if he won’t withdraw his case. This is exactly what happened to the attorney who defended Congressman James Traficant of Ohio in July of 2002. She had her license pulled because Traficant was a scapegoat who they wanted to make into a public outcast by leaving him without legal representation so that he would have to defend himself in the courtroom and would be more likely to lose!

Let’s think about this for a minute folks. The First Amendment guarantees us a right of free speech. The right of free speech includes the right to either not speak or to appoint someone else to speak for us. When we hire an attorney to speak for us, it shouldn’t matter whether he is “deemed licensed” to practice law by anyone, because we are paying the money to hire him. The government and the bar association who is in bed with them uses the “magnanimous” but fraudulent and ridiculous excuse that they have to license attorneys to protect us from predators and from our own indiscriminate taste in lawyers so that only ethical and upstanding lawyers can “practice” law. This just interferes with the rule of supply and demand and jacks up the price. The only reason to license lawyers is because:

1. It restricts the supply of lawyers so that the price is jacked up, which makes legal representation unaffordable for the vast majority of individuals.
2. It creates a source of additional leverage for the government when the government or its officers are prosecuted for wrongdoing.
3. Because malpractice insurance companies may charge higher premiums to insure lawyers who aren’t licensed.

But remember that a license is legally defined as “permission from the state to do that which otherwise illegal”, and the implication is that it is illegal for an unlicensed attorney to talk in front of a judge or jury. Common sense tells us that this violates the First Amendment guarantee of free speech. As reasonable men, we must therefore conclude that the American Bar Association (ABA) is nothing but a lawyer union that wants to jack up its own salaries by restricting the supply of lawyers and which is in bed with federal judges to help illegally expand their jurisdiction in return for the privilege of having those inflated salaries.

The following supreme Court cases held that a State may not pass statutes prohibiting the unauthorized practice of law or to interfere with the Right to freedom of speech, secured in the First Amendment: United Mine Workers v. Illinois Bar Association, 389 U.S. 217, and NAACP v. Button, 371 U.S. 415, and also in Brotherhood of Railhood Trainmen v. Virginia State Bar, 377 U.S. 1 (1964).

2.8.13.5 Protective Orders and Motions in Limine

The most common thing that people want to do who know they are doing wrong is hide the evidence. This was true of the first sinner Eve and every human after her who sinned. The book of Genesis chapter 3, verses 6 through 19, in the Bible records that the first human to sin, Eve, after she sinned by disobeying God and eating the fruit from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, first hid her shameful nakedness with a leaf, and then hid with Adam when God approached. Sinners have been hiding the evidence ever since, and defense lawyers actually make a large part of their livelihood from being good at hiding evidence and avoiding direct or revealing answers in depositions. No doubt, we would need a LOT fewer lawyers and judges if people just told the truth and did the right thing to begin with. We must remember that a “lying tongue” is one of the seven things that God hates (see Prov. 6:19). Why then would we want to violate God’s law by using man’s laws or our legal system to encourage or protect fraud by allowing for protective orders?

Jesus in the Bible repeats this same theme of the desire to hide evidence as being the hallmark of sinners and wrongdoers again in John 3:18-21:

"He who believes in Him [Jesus, the Son of God] is not condemned: but he who does not believe is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that the light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For everyone practicing evil hates the light and does not come to the light, lest his deeds should be exposed. But he who does the truth comes to the light, that his deeds may be clearly seen, that they have been done in God." [John 3:18-21, Bible]

In a massive conflict of interest, judges in federal courts very often do the same thing that Eve did by conspiring with the government prosecutor (usually from the DOJ) to try to hide evidence of wrongdoing by either the government or by employees of the government. The easiest way for them to conspire in this cover-up is to grant a pre-trial motion by the Department of Justice for a protective order, often without argument or explanation, and even as an Ex Parte emergency motion so that the opposing side doesn’t even have a chance to prepare for the hearing. A protective order is an order by the court to cease certain types of discovery of evidence for use in trial. A protective order might be issued, for instance, to bar the plaintiff in a civil suit from deposing a government witness to ask him questions or it might prevent the subpoena of government documents related to the government wrongdoing. Because the protective order is issued BEFORE the trial, the truth is suppressed before the jury ever has a chance to hear it. This is what they did at Congressman Traficant’s trial in July 2002, who was a vocal opponent of the IRS and the income tax.

Another type of order by the judge that biases a case in the government’s favor is what is called a “motion in limine”, whereby the government prosecutor before the trial asks to exclude certain pieces of evidence from the upcoming trial that would cause the government to lose its case. This happens very often with evidence that is totally credible but would be disadvantageous to the government. The way to prevent being victimized by such tactics is to ensure that you keep the ORIGINAL copy of all correspondence you send the government, and send it with a Certificate of Service documenting everything you sent. Typically, judges will use the excuse in granting a motion in limine that the documents are photocopies and that the chain of custody and therefore the foundation of the evidence is untrustworthy.
Federal judges seldom have to even justify why they granted the order and even the fact that the order was granted is not allowed by the judge to be revealed to the jury even though it should because it constitutes evidence of massive conflict of interest and obstruction of justice. When they make the protective order, they will often tell the clerk of the court to make their comments off the record so they can’t be prosecuted for doing so. When this happens, you ought to tape record it and prosecute them for conflict of interest (28 U.S.C. §455) and obstruction of justice! If the party who is wronged by the protective order then tries to prosecute the judge for wrongdoing and obstruction of justice, his license to practice law is pulled if he is an attorney. If he is a pro per litigant representing himself, he is fined by the court for submitting “frivolous pleadings” as an unethical and immoral way to silence him in violation of the First Amendment and strike (remove) his pleadings from the record so there is no evidence or argument to convict the judge with! Judges look out for each other and play golf together, you know. It’s a good old boy network that MUST be eliminated if we are ever to have justice and equality of rights under the law and restore our society to the status of being a government of laws rather than men.

All of this discussion underscores the following words of wisdom:

“There can be no justice without truth."

If the judge won’t allow the truth to be admitted into evidence during the trial or discussed, he is simply inviting more litigation and not allowing the issue to be resolved. This does a disservice to our justice system, undermines its credibility, and causes massive injustice against the rights and liberties of Americans everywhere. It is a reasonable offense also because it covers up a violation of the oath of office for the judge in question. In most cases, juries decide only the facts and apply the law as given to them by the judge. But if the judge is corrupt and biased and the jury detects that the judge is involved in this kind of cover-up, then Thomas Jefferson said that the jury then has the duty to decide both the facts AND the law, and in many cases, to rule against the law as being unjust or at least rule that a different judge is needed to hear the case:

"It is left... to the juries, if they think the permanent judges are under any bias whatever in any cause, to take on themselves to judge the law as well as the fact. They never exercise this power but when they suspect partially in the judges; and by the exercise of this power they have been the firmest bulwarks of English liberty."
[Thomas Jefferson to Abbe Arnoux, 1789. ME 7:423, Papers 15:283 ]

2.8.13.6 "Frivolous” Penalties

The First Amendment guarantees every American the right to petition their government for Redress of Grievances/wrongs. Because this amendment recognizes but not creates a right, and because the exercise of rights cannot be legally penalized or taxed or restricted or regulated by the government, then at least theoretically, it is illegal for a judge to fine or sanction a litigant no matter what he says in his pleadings, and even if they are totally without merit! This isn’t true of his GOVERNMENT LICENSED (conflict of interest!) attorney, but it is certainly true of the litigant who is represented by the attorney. However, in some instances, federal judges have been known to fine litigants up to $25,000 for frivolous pleadings if they are litigating a very embarrassing issue against the government. An example of such an embarrassing issue would be the 861 source position described later in Chapter 5 or any other issue that would destroy government revenues from income taxes. Corrupt federal judges use frivolous penalties in order to:

1. Protect the government or its employees from prosecution.
2. Avoid having to tell the truth or rule on a “hot-potato” issue that could threaten their job
3. Discourage future lawsuits on the same subject.

What often happens is the judge will sanction the attorney rather than the litigant because they can’t fine the litigant, who has First Amendment rights, and of course the attorney passes on the cost to the litigant. Even if the case is a good one with legal merit and good arguments, many attorneys will refuse to take the case if they think the judge will be biased or could sanction them. This further discourages future suits on the same subject.

We must remember, however, what it means to be frivolous:

"Frivolous:

Of little weight or importance. A pleading is "frivolous” when it is clearly insufficient on its face and does not controvert the material points of the opposite pleading, and is presumably interposed for mere purposes of delay or to embarrass the opponent. A claim or defense is frivolous if a proponent can present no rational argument based upon the evidence or law in support of that claim or defense. Liebowitz v. Aimexco Inc., Co.App., 701
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P.2d. 140, 142. Frivolous pleadings may be amended to proper form or ordered stricken under federal and state rules of civil procedure.”

Even though the pleading is rational, organized, and focused on substantive legal issues, judges will routinely try to sanction pro per litigants who are defending themselves without a lawyer. They will use the excuse that the litigant is inexperienced, incompetent, and every other type of verbally abusive but unsubstantiated rhetoric they can think of. They have to do this because pro per litigants are the most dangerous type of litigants since they:

1. Don’t have any legal fees, they can litigate endlessly against the government and must be discouraged from doing so.
2. Aren’t licensed like typical attorneys, the court can’t threaten to pull their license if they don’t like the subject of the suit or its adverse impact on the government.
3. Haven’t given jurisdiction to the court by hiring an attorney. All persons who hire an attorney automatically admit the jurisdiction of the court over them and therefore cannot challenge the court’s jurisdiction:

   **In Propria Persona.** In one’s own proper person. It is a rule in pleading that pleas to the jurisdiction of the court must be plead in propria persona, because if pleaded by an attorney they admit the jurisdiction, as an attorney is an officer of the court, and he is presumed to plead after having obtained leave, which admits the jurisdiction. Lawes, Pl. 91.

Therefore, frivolous penalties are the most prevalent kind of violation of the First Amendment that federal judges like to use to gag pro per litigants, and especially if they are vexatious (outspoken, articulate, organized, and very combative). It’s an obvious conflict of interest where the suit is against the government or one of its employees, and for that reason, it may be preferable to pursue your suit against the government **agent** as a private person and ensure that you get a jury trial to make the ruling as unbiased as possible.

Lastly, if you are sanctioned with frivolous penalties and then try to litigate the same matter again, then tyrannical judges sometimes will increase the sanctions and justify their action by saying that the matters you litigated were already resolved. In most cases, they will not be resolved from the previous ruling because any time you litigate matters found in this book, they will collude in the cover-up of these materials and try to use protective orders to keep you from doing complete discovery. If they had not attempted the protective order and had allowed your evidence and findings into the court record and had published that court record, then they would be correct in saying that the matters were resolved and in instituting additional sanctions, but this combination of factors seldom happens with tax honesty advocates because of the government cover-up of the truth and tyranny in maintaining their power. Remember:

   “There can be no justice without truth, “

If the judge will not allow the truth or evidence of the truth to be admitted into evidence or discussed in the courtroom, then the issues you are litigating have not been resolved and no sanction should therefore be instituted unless and until the truth is fully explored, exposed, and decided upon by an impartial jury. Sometimes the judge will cite previous cases as his authority or excuse why he doesn’t have to deal with your issues and say it has been decided already, but in many cases, he will cite **unpublished cases**, which doesn’t expose the truth, or the case won’t have explored the truth at all and he will be hoping you don’t know how to do case research to discover their fraud and obstruction of justice.

If you would like to know more about the meaning of the word “frivolous”, see the reference below:

**Meaning of the Word “Frivolous”**, Form #05.027
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

### 2.8.13.7 Fifth Amendment Abuses

“Constitutional privilege against self-incrimination applies to civil as well as criminal proceedings”
[McCarthy v. Arndstein, 266 U.S. 34, 45 S.Ct. 16 (1924)]

Judges and government lawyers are aided in their abuse of our liberties by deliberate and flagrant violations of the Fifth Amendment. The Fifth Amendment says:

   “No person shall be ... compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself,“
What they will tell ignorant litigants opposing the government is that the Fifth Amendment only protects testimony in a criminal trial, not a civil trial such as those involving taxes. The judge will then threaten to sanction such a litigant for contempt of court if he does not testify, hoping that he will provide enough information to make the government’s case.

However, this approach violates the precedents of the United States supreme Court, which said on the subject:

“The [Fifth Amendment] privilege reflects a complex of our fundamental values and aspirations, and marks an important advance in the development of our liberty. It can be asserted in any proceeding, civil or criminal, administrative or judicial, investigatory or adjudicatory; and it [406 U.S. 441, 445] protects against any disclosures that the witness reasonably believes could be used in a criminal prosecution or could lead to other evidence that might be so used. This Court has been zealous to safeguard the values that underlie the privilege.”

[Kastigar v. United States, 406 U.S. 441 (1972)]

Why do you think the Fifth Amendment protects testimony even in a civil or tax trial? The reason is because a criminal trial could result from the testimony in a civil trial! This is what the supreme Court calls a “derivative use”. If the government puts you on the stand in a civil trial related to the imposition of penalties and the payment of a tax, and finds out that you committed criminal fraud based on your testimony, then they might later decide to indict you based on your testimony for a criminal offense and use your own testimony as evidence. Consequently, you can confidently assert the privilege in either a civil or a criminal trial and if the government wants to compel you, then all you have to do is demand immunity under 18 U.S.C. §6002. The ruling in Kastigar upholds the doctrine that such immunity, although granted by the federal government as the sovereign, also affords immunity from state prosecution as well.

“[A] state witness may not be compelled to give testimony which may be incriminating under federal law unless the compelled testimony and its fruits cannot be used in any manner by federal officials in connection with a criminal prosecution against him. We conclude, moreover, that in order to implement this constitutional rule and accommodate the interests of the State and Federal Governments in investigating and prosecuting crime, the Federal Government must be prohibited from making any such use of compelled testimony and its fruits. ” 42 U.S., at 79.

[Kastigar v. United States, 406 U.S. 441 (1972)]

Furthermore, if the state or federal governments attempt to introduce evidence in a criminal or civil proceeding where there was previous testimony under which immunity was granted, they have an affirmative duty as follows, citing again from Kastigar:

A person accorded this immunity under 18 U.S.C. §6002, and subsequently prosecuted, is not dependent for the preservation of his rights upon the integrity and good faith of the prosecuting authorities. As stated in Murphy:

“Once a defendant demonstrates that he has testified, under a state grant of immunity, to matters related to the federal prosecution, the federal authorities have the burden of showing that their evidence is not tainted by establishing that they had an independent, legitimate source for the disputed evidence.” 378 U.S., at 79 n. 18.

This burden of proof, which we reaffirm as appropriate, is not limited to a negation of taint; rather, it imposes on the prosecution the affirmative duty to prove that the evidence it proposes to use is derived from a legitimate source wholly independent of the compelled testimony. [406 U.S. 441, 461]

Consequently, if a judge in a civil trial tries to compel you as a litigant and not a third party witness to testify after you have asserted your Fifth Amendment rights by saying that those rights only apply to criminal trials, then he is either ignorant, incompetent, or corrupt, or any combination of the foregoing.

Along the same lines, corrupt judges will also try to assert that being compelled to submit tax returns is not a violation of the Fifth Amendment. We know from the U.S. supreme Court ruling in Garner v. U.S., 424 U.S. 648 (1976), however, that tax returns constitute the compelled testimony of a witness. Several cases have litigated this issue, including William Conklin v. IRS, No. 89N 1514 (unpublished), U.S. v. Troeschser, No. 95-55609 (unpublished), etc., and in all cases, the government has wiggled out of claiming that tax returns don’t violate the Fifth Amendment because they are voluntary, which just reinforces our point throughout all of Chapter 5 that income taxes under Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code are and always have been voluntary and that calling them a “tax” is a misnomer, because they are really just a “donation”! This provides a good
transition into our next section about nonpublication of court rulings, because both of these cases were unpublished for the obvious reason that the government doesn’t want the average American to know that income taxes are voluntary so they made the rulings in the above cases unpublished so that it could not be cited as an authority in later cases.

2.8.13.8 Nonpublication of Court Rulings

Nonpublication is the act by a judge of making a ruling without putting the pleadings or ruling of the case into the official, published government court record accessible to the general public. Nonpublication is very commonly used in our courts today, and especially in the federal courts on cases involving income tax issues. The reasons for this are clear: Federal judges work hand in hand with the IRS to mistreat and abuse Americans by denying their constitutional rights to life, liberty and property and then cover up that fact in order to escape culpability and prevent successful techniques or information used against the government from being learned about or reused by other freedom fighters. This section summarizes some of the issues related to nonpublication by our courts. You can obtain further information about this subject on our website at:

http://famguardian.org/Subjects/LawAndGovt/LegalEthics/Nonpublication/Arguments/index.htm

2.8.13.8.1 Background

1. From time immemorial, the test of fair judgment has been the willingness of a court to apply the same rules consistently.
2. Our legal system is based on the principle that each of us is allowed our day in court. Secret opinions destroy this principle because our day in court is no longer open.
3. Selected publication policies of the courts imply that every court of appeal opinion is presumptively unworthy of publication, unless such opinion meets an arbitrary standard that it (1) establishes a new rule of law or alters or modifies an existing rule, 2) involves a legal issue of continuing public interest, or (3) criticizes existing law.

2.8.13.8.2 Publication Procedures Have Been Changed Unilaterally

1. The transition to a policy that comes close to uniform non-publication has been so gradual that very few lawyers, let alone members of the general public, have any idea that this destruction of the appellate system of law has taken place.
2. The movement toward limited publication is usually traced back to the 1971 Annual Report by the Federal Judicial Center.
3. Only a third of federal courts' opinions are now published.
4. In 1997, 93 percent of the opinions and handed down by California appellate justices were unpublished.
5. Changes in reporting procedures have been put in place throughout the United States unilaterally, only in the last three decades, without any public or legislative input.

2.8.13.8.3 Publication is Essential to a Legal System Based on Precedent

1. The notion and that rulings that are inconsistent with precedent should not be published goes against a fundamental reality: decisions that are inconsistent with the weight of precedent are, by definition, law-making.
2. The weight of precedent on a point of law hardens it, making it more difficult to overturn. The sheer number of affirmations allow attorneys to rely on the stability of a doctrine with greater confidence.
3. Put a different way: a court may ignore one precedent but rarely a dozen.
4. Later cases help flesh out a precedent, and help to make it more understandable.
5. The sheer accumulation of a number of seemingly routine decisions on a particular point of law may suggest to the courts, legal practitioners, scholars, the legislature, or the public that problems exist in this area. This may set in motion reform.
6. Publication furthers an important institutional goal: maintaining the appearance that justice has been done. Publication is a signal to litigants and observers that court has nothing tied, that the quality of its work in a case is open for public inspection.

2.8.13.8.4 Citizens In A Democracy are Entitled to Consistent Treatment from the Courts
Chapter 2: U.S. Government Background

1. The federal courts are not works of art to be protected from the profane and the trivial. Nor are they debating or learned societies that exist to enhance the professional satisfaction of the judges. They are a public resource.

2. Explanation is fundamental to our system of justice.

3. The signed the opinion assigns responsibility. The author of a bad opinion cannot behind the shield of anonymity; blame or praise worthiness is there for all to see.

4. Similarly situated parties are entitled to receive like treatment in the courts. Where there is no assurance that an opinion will be published, no litigant can be certain that his case will be decided by the Court of Appeal in accordance with principles of law followed in similar cases.

5. If an appeals court unilaterally changes public law by a decision and then marks that opinions "not for publication," it effectively rules that its changes do not apply to all similar circumstances, but instead, apply only to the appellant.

6. An unreported decision means that judgment may be completely different from one person to another even if the facts are exactly the same. By declaring itself unbound by precedent and uncommitted to the future use of precedent, the court makes law for one person only. This is, de facto, a judicial bill of attainder.

2.8.13.8.5 Operational Realities of Non-Publication

1. Nearly all circuits use staff attorneys or staff law clerks to help screen cases for full or summary appellate procedure. The screening decision inevitably coincides to a great extent with the publication decision. Thus, the reliance upon staff attorneys combined with a predisposition toward non-publication seriously diminishes the responsibility that the judge bears for his decisions.

2. Because law clerk influence is likely to be the greatest in less important cases, which are not argued and will not be published, diminished quality, once again, will be most prevalent there.

3. In practice, publication decisions, once made, are usually cast in concrete, and a party seeking reconsideration is perceived as adverse and meets solid resistance in the court.

4. Selective publication undermines fundamental legal functions by limiting the Supreme Court's ability to correct inconsistent appellate decisions where there is no petition for hearing.

5. Litigants whose situation is complicated by an unpublished opinion can count on the Supreme Court for relief only in theory. High courts take a few cases, and even fewer that have not been published. For most litigants, then, a court of appeal is the court of last resort.

6. Non-publication raises the genuine possibility that a subsequent panel, unaware of a prior result, might reach a contrary result, creating a conflict in the law.

7. If there is only one circuit court opinion on issue, another court might feel justified in reaching a different result. However, in several panels or circuit has spoken on different variations of the issue, it will be the rare court which will take a different path. Thus, more published opinions make the law more stable. And conversely, more unpublished opinions destabilize the law.

8. Non-publication also creates the possibility that a court may decline to publish an opinion to avoid calling attention to the fact that its opinion conflicts with a prior holding.

9. Judges appear to be caught in a serious dilemma: if they pay no attention to their unpublished decisions, they risk inconsistency; if they consult those opinions, they appear to be using them is precedent.

10. No citation rules significantly diminish the possibility of review based upon conflict among the circuits. The very notion of a conflict is theoretically attenuated; can be said, for instance, that conflict exists between two circuit courts that have come to opposite results on a single issue when each one insists that its determination is not precedential?

11. An attorney seeking a writ of certiorari is unlikely to know of the unpublished law of other circuits and therefore, will be unable to draw the Supreme Court's attention to the existence of a conflict.

12. Similarly, the fact that unpublished opinions are typically not as thorough or as elaborate as reported opinions makes it more difficult for the Supreme Court to determine exactly what the lower court has done and accept the case for review.

2.8.13.8.6 Impact Of Non-Publication Inside the Courts

1. Those who choose what opinions to publish may consciously decide to suppress an opinion they know to be significant enough to publish either to escape review by a higher court, to escape criticism for a controversial decision, or even to allow a court to get away with making a decision contrary to prevailing law.

2. Unpublished opinions inevitably contribute to conflicts of decision. Unpublished opinions may conflict with other unpublished opinions; worse, existing conflicts between unpublished opinions, and prior, published opinions are considerably more difficult to justify.
3. The refusal to publish undercuts the ability of appellate divisions to cross check on each court's acumen. This further erodes quality-control.
4. Many unpublished opinions have been found to be dreadful in quality, clearly falling below minimal standards of legal scholarship and consistency.
5. The poor writing quality or unnecessary brevity of most unpublished opinions makes it difficult to identify examples of inconsistency or suppressed precedent. Lack of publication thus compounds inequitable treatment under the law.
6. When errors are not brought to public attention via publication, courts may continue to decide low-profile cases wrongly for years.
7. Inequality of publication rates within appellate divisions in larger states further compounds the essential inequality of the basic practice of nonpublication. In some California appellate divisions, fewer than 3% of cases are published. This raises fundamental questions about whether the court is fulfilling its constitutional duty.
8. The criteria for publication cannot help but be applied unevenly. Cases that qualify for publication remained unpublished.
9. Similarly, procedures for requesting publication work unequally and capriciously. Even if the court is inclined to permit publication (an uncommon occurrence) only the parties and institutional litigants have practical access to unpublished opinions, and they frequently do not have an interest in seeking publication.
10. Depublication rules have been used by the California Supreme Court and by the appellate courts in order to silence criticism of their own rules by lower courts.

2.8.13.8.7 Openness

1. There is no difference between non-publication of judicial decisions and any other instance of unjustified secrecy in government.
2. The argument that public interest must be distinguished from public curiosity is without value: it reflects a disregard for the people's right and ability to decide for themselves what aspects of their government's activities are worthy of their attention.
3. There is no such thing as unnecessary public curiosity with regard to the courts: unlike matters of national security or police intelligence, the courts have nothing to hide.
4. What goes on in the courts is public business and therefore, unpublished appellate opinions -- whether cut-and-dried or not -- which contain any matters that arguably provide insight into the judicial process should be freely citable, and should -- the same as any other acts of government -- been subject to open public scrutiny and discussion.
5. Wide publication would reduce, if not eliminate, the wasted time, money, and human effort that is expended daily in pursuing, administering, and terminating fruitless appeals, whose points of law already have been decided in prior unpublished opinions.
6. If a court is not willing to stand by a decision as a valid precedent for all, then the decision should not be made or should be regarded as unenforceable.
7. The lasting authority of a decision depends largely on the quality of its reasoning, which can be evaluated only by reading the opinion.

2.8.13.8.8 Constitutional Considerations

1. Inefficiency of judicial operations is certainly not a desirable objective; it may, however, be a price worth paying if it buys or helps to buy individual liberty.
2. Inequities in publication consist of concerns over fundamental First Amendment rights of petition for redress of grievances and over equal access to the courts which involve both the procedural and the substantial due process provision.
3. Inequities in publication also involve the equal protection provision of the Fourteenth Amendment.
4. Inequities in publication present a challenge to the constitutional strictures that prescribe the duty of adjudication and demand a separation of powers between the legislative and judicial branches of government.
5. The Supreme Court of United States has held repeatedly that the due process clauses of the fifth and fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution prohibit a vague law because it is like a secret law to which no one has access.
6. Many legal doctrines illustrate the importance of the law being knowable and accessible: for example, the void for vagueness doctrine, limitations on retroactive legislation, restrictions on retroactive overruling of judicial decisions, and requirements regarding prison law libraries.
7. An unpublished appellate decision may create new law de facto, but is unexposed to the scrutiny of the public or the legislature. Moreover, the refusal to publish sends a message that the public in general and other potentially interested parties will never be affected by the law promulgated in this situation.

8. An ever-growing body of decisional law is invaluable asset and the essence of a stable system that renders consistent judgments. New democracies throughout the world specifically bemoan a lack of such precedents. Totalitarian regimes, by definition, act unilaterally, are bound by no precedents, and are unaccountable.

2.8.13.8.9 **Opinions Are Necessary, Even in “Insignificant Matters”**

1. It is false to condition non-publication on the assumption that most decisions only serve a dispute-settling function among two parties. Readers can compare and evaluate the majority opinion alongside any concurring or dissenting opinions to determine precisely what the court decided, and how far its decision may extend in future cases.

2. Opinions facilitate the discovery of conflicts in the law.

3. Opinions also permit readers to view the law's historical development and trace its impact on the society.

4. Opinions that create inconsistencies must be considered law-making opinions; by definition, they depart noticeably from the established course of decisions. Such opinion should always be published.

5. Unpublished opinions, especially ones that cannot be cited, will generally not receive critical commentary from the bench, the bar, scholars, and the public, for the obvious reason that they will go unnoticed. Moreover, there's little incentive to comment upon an opinion that is not "law."

2.8.13.8.10 **Impact On The Legal System In Society**

1. Selective publication creates inequality of access to case law by making pertinent and unpublished opinions available largely to institutional and specialized lawyers.

2. Selective publication deprives trial judges, lawyers, litigants, and members of society of guidance.

3. Selective publication decreases trial court compliance with the law, thus contributing to increased appellate litigation.

4. The loss of precedent has driven many parties into alternative methods of dispute resolution. Simultaneously, it has made litigation to final judgment after appeal unavoidable because results have become random.

5. Non-publication guarantees inequity in the legal establishment. It produces two classes of lawyers: the uninitiated ordinary practitioner who keeps up with the advance sheets and knows only what he reads there, and the specialist-insider who collects unpublished opinions in his field as well, and therefore possesses a special insight into the thinking of the intermediate appellate courts.

6. Widespread uncertainty in the law erodes professional competence and the confidence of lawyers in the quality of their work. This, in turn, feeds misconduct, which is tolerated until it becomes the norm.

7. Moreover, unequal access to unpublished decisions creates a "grapevine" among appellate judges and their research attorneys, and among attorneys who practice solely in one particular area of the law, whereby earlier unpublished opinions are relied on expressly or implicitly.

8. Nonpublication subverts one of the most important forces in the development of the law: scholarly commentary. One of the most potent analytical tools in the hands of a legal commentator is an abundance of decisional law from which he can extract trends in the law, based on an assessment of how the rule of law is being judicially articulated, or how it may be operating in application.

9. Most important of all, selective publication contributes to popular distrust of the courts.

2.8.13.8.11 **Questions to Ponder**

1. How can we have the equal protection of the law if the courts have no institutional memory of the manner in which the laws are applied in similar cases?

2. How can we be certain that our judges correctly and honestly state the law, if their decisions are not put out to the people for criticism?

3. How can we ask our legislators to correct the law if we cannot know how the law is actually being applied by our courts?

4. What effect does our right to equal protection of the law have if law can be applied to one person without immediately causing others who would otherwise be affected to complain on that person's behalf when the rule used is illegal, unconstitutional, or unjust?

5. If experience shows that unpublished rulings truly add nothing to law, why do lawyers and judges continue to research unpublished opinions in preparing their briefs?
2.9 The Social Security Fraud

“All socialism involves slavery.”
[Herbert Spencer]

“The government that robs Peter to pay Paul can always depend on the support of Paul.”
[George Bernard Shaw]

“A democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can only exist until the voters discover that they can vote themselves money from the Public Treasury. From that moment on, the majority always votes for the candidate promising the most benefits from the Public Treasury with the result that a democracy always collapses over loose fiscal policy always followed by dictatorship.”
[Alexander Fraser Tytler, “The Decline and Fall of the Athenian Republic”]

"A tax, in the general understanding of the term and as used in the constitution, signifies an exaction for the support of the government. The word has never thought to connote the expropriation of money from one group for the benefit of another.”
[U.S. Supreme Court in United States v. William M. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936)]

2.9.1 Social Security is NOT a contract

We the People were warned by the supreme Court in Helvering v. Davis, 301 U.S. 619, 81 L.Ed. 1307, 57 S.Ct. 1307 (1937) that Social Security is not insurance but “welfare;” and in Flemming v. Nestor, 363 U.S. 603, 4 L.Ed.2d. 1435, 80 S.Ct. 1367 (1960) that we have no vested interest. Having no vested interest informs us that payment from the Social Security system is discretionary and not obligatory. Congress can change the laws at any time without our consent. Thus, by law and contract, when you retire FICA is not required to compensate you at all!

This leads one to question why we should pay ANYTHING into Social Security and why the government hypocritically regards the Citizen’s participation as contractual. After all, when people refuse to contribute to or participate in the voluntary Social Security insurance program, the government and the IRS goes after them as if some kind of unwritten contract that they never explicitly signed has been violated! But how could it be a contract? In most cases, we never signed up. Our parents signed us up, so our explicit consent as an adult was never obtained. A contract based on an application we never personally even completed has to be a fraud. That fraud is described in detail in:

Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002
http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

2.9.2 Social Security is Voluntary Not Mandatory

EEOC vs. Information Systems Consulting, Inc.

Because SOCIAL SECURITY IS VOLUNTARY, the Justice Department argued for the EEOC (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) against an employer in Texas who had, under IRS advice, refused to hire an individual who would not provide a social security number. The complaint was styled as a DISCRIMINATION action.

The discrimination involves both religious convictions, and national origins (Americans are not required).

The IRS refused to appear in court to defend its advice to the employer, who immediately folded when confronted in court with a team of Justice Department lawyers suing him for discrimination. (Who wants to be in court against the Justice Department without any legal facts to stand on ?)

The case proves beyond the shadow of any doubt whatsoever that it is NOT necessary to use a social security number in association with your personal finances and earnings, IF YOU CHOOSE NOT TO, because Social Security IS STRICTLY A VOLUNTARY SYSTEM AND YOU MUST SPECIFICALLY MAKE APPLICATION FOR "BENEFITS" TO PARTICIPATE. If you DO NOT make application, can you be FORCED by the government to take a number ? NO ! Can you be forced to use and supply a number that you do not have, and do not HAVE to have ? NO ! WHY DID YOU APPLY CITIZEN IS SOVEREIGN IN THIS LAND, the first COUNTRY OF KINGS !
IS GOVERNMENT THE PUBLIC SERVANT OR ARE YOU THEIR SERVANT

NOW! EXCERPTS FROM EEOC v. Information Systems Consulting
CA3-92-0169-T

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

1. From the EEOC’s Letter of Determination, Dated May 2, 1990 (p.2):

The evidence supports the charge that there is a violation of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, as amended.... Section 706(b) of Title VII requires that if the commission determines there is a reasonable cause to believe that the charge is true, it shall endeavor to eliminate the alleged unlawful employment practice by informal methods, of conference, conciliation, and persuasion, having determined there is reasonable cause to believe the charge is true, the Commission now invites the parties to join with it in a collective effort toward a just resolution of this matter.

2. From the Affidavit of Tim Fitzpatrick, September 29, 1989 (p.3):

After discussions with the IRS, the company discovered that if Mr. Hanson did not provide the company with a Social Security number, the company would be in violation of the Internal Revenue Regulations and subject to various penalties.

3. From the Plaintiff’s Response to Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss, April 1, 1992 (p.8-9)

"....the Internal Revenue Code and the Regulations promulgated pursuant to the code do not contain an absolute requirement that an employer provide an employee social security number to the IRS.

Internal Revenue Code Section 6109(a)(3) states:

"Any person required under the authority of this title to make a return, statement or other document with respect to another person, shall request from such person, and include in any such return, statement or document, such identifying number as may be prescribed for securing proper identification of such person."


The IRS regulation interpreting section 6109 provides:

"If he does not know the taxpayer identifying number of the other person, he shall request such number of the other person. A request should state that the identifying number is required to be furnished under the law. When the person filing the return, statement, or other document does not know the number of the other person, and has complied with the request provision of this paragraph, he shall sign an affidavit on the transmittal document forwarding such returns, statements, or other documents to the Internal Revenue Service so stating."

[Treas. Reg. 301.6109-1(c ) (1991)]

"The applicable IRS statute and regulation place a duty on the employer to request a taxpayer identifying number from the employee. If document must be filed and the employer has been unable to obtain the number but has made the request then the employer need only include as affidavit stating that the request was made."

The Government also avers that:

"In 1989, Internal Revenue Code, Section 6676, 26 U.S.C. and 6676 (1989), set forth the penalties for failing to supply the IRS with identifying numbers as required by the code....a $50.00 penalty will be imposed for failure of an employer to provide an identifying number on any document filed with the IRS unless it is shown that the failure was due to reasonable cause and not willful neglect. The Treasury Regulation interpreting the Statute states:

Under Section 301.609-1(c ) a payor is required to request the identifying number of the payee. If after such a request has been made, the payee does not furnish the payor with his identifying number, the penalty will not be assessed against the payor.

[Treas. Reg. 3106676-1 (1989)]
"Public Law 101-239, Title VII, Section 7711(b)(1), Dec 19, 1989, 103 Stat. 2393, repealed Section 6676 of the Internal Revenue Code, 26 U.S.C. 6723 (Supp. 1992) has governed the failure to comply with information reporting requirement. However, Internal Revenue Code Section 6724, 26 U.S.C. 6724 (Supp. 1992), provides for a waiver of any penalties assessed under the code upon a showing of reasonable cause. Section 6724(a) provides:

No penalty shall be imposed under this part with respect to any failure if it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not willful neglect.

[26 U.S.C. §6724(a) (Supp. 1992)]

4.) From the Consent Decree, dated November 4, 1992 (p.4)

The defendant ... shall be permanently enjoined from terminating an employee or refusing to hire an individual for failure to provide a social security number.... If an employee or applicant for employment advises the defendant that he does not have a social security number....., the defendant shall request, pursuant to Section 6724 of the Internal Revenue Service Code {sic}, 26 U.S.C. §6724, a waiver of any penalties that may be imposed for failing to include an employee social security number on forms and documents submitted to the IRS.

YOU SEE, SOCIAL SECURITY IS VOLUNTARY - NOT MANDATORY!

2.9.3 A Legal Con Game (Forbes Magazine, March 27, 1995)

by: Dr. Thomas Sowell. An economist and a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution in Stanford, CA.

"If Social Security were run by private business people, they would have been locked up long ago."

Even the most gung ho budget-cutters in Washington make it a point to say that Social Security is off-limits. From a purely political point of view, it is easy to see why. People who are retired and dependent for at least part of their support (or amenities) on their Social Security checks would of course be outraged and up in arms if the federal government reneged on its promises and pulled the rug out from under them.

While this is the strongest argument against cutting Social Security, it is also the most transient argument. If we are trapped by the promises of the past, we can at least stop making the same promises for the future. Assure all those currently receiving Social Security checks that they will not lose one red cent. Say it loud and clear. Say it on every appropriate occasion and on a few inappropriate ones.

Give the same assurances to those within a decade of their eligibility for Social Security. But there is no reason to continue forever subsidizing everyone who reaches a certain age--and it is certainly unconscionable to do so with a regressive tax on the young, who generally have lower incomes and fewer assets than their elders, whom they are subsidizing.

If there are elderly people who are needy, let them be subsidized out of general revenues, from which a transitional phase out of Social Security could also be financed.

Among those who want Social Security to be left alone, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan makes the case as well as it can be made when he says that "welfare is not the idea behind Social Security," that it was "envisioned from the beginning as a social-insurance" is not the same thing as an "entitlement." But even this strongest case cannot withstand scrutiny.

What does it matter what Social Security was envisioned as? I may envision myself as another Rudolf Nureyev, but that will not stop others from saying that I am a klutz on the dance floor.

As for the argument that people who have put contributions in are not welfare recipients when they take money out, that of course all depends on how much they put in and how much they take out. I have been faithfully putting money into a local bank for more than a decade, but if I present the teller with a withdrawal slip for a million dollars, the bank is not about to honor it.
Even if I were as eloquent as senator Moynihan, it would remain stubbornly unconvinced and remind me that I never put a million in.

The clincher for those who argue like Senator Moynihan is that Social Security is currently running a surplus and that its reserve is expected to reach $3 trillion by the year 2020. Even if we assume that foresight, like hindsight, is 20/20, there is still a lot less to this argument than meets the eye.

All of us can run a surplus, if we are allowed to count all our assets and ignore enough of our liabilities. No insurance company can make up its own accounting rules, ignore its accrued liabilities represented by the policies it has promised to pay off, and say that it has a surplus whenever the money it takes in during the morning covers the checks it writes in the afternoon.

As for the assets of the Social Security fund, $3 trillion is certainly a lot of money—but not if you owe $4 trillion.

The words "insurance" and "contribution"—as in the Federal Insurance Contribution Act (FICA)—are among the political strokes of genius which have made Social Security sacrosanct. Like so much political genius, these words represent pure fraud.

The word "insurance serves the political purpose of removing the onus of its being a handout like welfare or other entitlement programs. But a genuine insurance system collects money and invests it in assets which cover its liabilities. It is not insurance but a pyramid scheme in which those who enrolled earlier get what is paid in by those who enroll later.

This worked like a charm as long as the pyramid kept expanding, with the baby boomers' contribution being used to support the smaller generation before it. Not only could the first generation receive back far more than it put in, all sorts of new goodies could be added to the Social Security program by a bountiful Congress. But when the baby boomers themselves reach their retirement age, the system will be faced with the same financial problems as other pyramid schemes when the pyramid stops growing.

Senator Moynihan says that any future problems can be taken care of if we just "bump up the contribution rate a little." But why is such "bumping up" even necessary, if all the talk about a "surplus" and about people getting back what they contributed is not just political smoke and mirrors?

If a system is said to be sound because it can always be rescued later with more tax money, then the same could have been said of the savings and loan industry before its debacle.

2.9.4 The Legal Ponzi Scheme (Forbes Magazine, October 9, 1995)

by: Rita Koseika.

"Younger Americans have come to understand that for them, Social Security isn't a benefit, it's just another tax."

IF the U.S. Government were required to keep its books the way businesses are required to keep theirs, the national debt wouldn't be $5 trillion. It would be about $17 trillion, an amount equal to about 2.5 times the country's gross domestic product.

That $12 trillion difference is the estimated obligation of the government for its unfunded pension liabilities under Social Security.

Karl Borden, a professor of financial economics at the University of Nebraska, has a modest proposal for knocking that number down by a nice round $6 trillion. The Feds, he says, should offer a deal to all Americans under, say, 47. If they would agree to forgo the right to Social Security, they would no longer have to pay their share of payroll taxes. They could keep the 12.4% that Social Security docks from them and their employers on their before-tax incomes. "They could keep just half of that and they'd be better off," he emphasizes.

Without Social Security, who would fund their retirement? They would themselves. They would be allowed to put pretax income into IRA-type accounts. In place of a government pension, they would have a personal nest egg to draw on the retirement. With any luck they would earn a much higher return than their money is worth in the Social Security system.
But why would millions of people want to give up their pension rights, after having paid into Social Security for years? "It's a sucker bet for most of the population," Borden says.

When President Clinton pushed his big tax increase through Congress in 1993, 85% of the Social Security pension became taxable income to people with substantial amounts of other income. This despite the fact that they had already been taxed on the money they put in. If you have savings and a private pension, the U.S. government taxes your Social Security contributions twice--before they go in and when they come out.

That broken promise is probably only a starter. Congress will almost certainly do such things as raise the pensionable retirement age and make Social Security need-based--a safety net rather than a pension plan. In the end only the disabled and seriously needy 70-year olds may get the pension we all paid for.

Uncle Sam won't have much choice but to renege. That $12 trillion in unfunded pension liabilities grows every year with the number of workers who enter the system.

Even if they don't know the specifics, most younger Americans have very low expectations of Social Security. Millions of them might well give up their claims in return for being allowed out of the system.

In our system there is no automatic accounting to the individual, and what he gets at the other end is presented as largesse from our kind Uncle Sam.

Under Borden's proposals the Social Security dropouts, as well as new entrants to the labor force, would join a system modeled after Chile's, which privatized its bankrupt social security system in 1981. In Chile, workers are required to put 10% of their pretax wages in private pension funds; New York based Bankers Trust owns one of the largest fund managers. The funds are carefully regulated, and workers can switch among them for better returns and lower costs. They get periodic statements.

At retirement, Chileans take their money to buy an annuity. Whatever is left can be passed on to their heirs. If there isn't enough to provide a decent living, the government steps in, guaranteeing a minimum.

Note the critical difference between Chile's system and ours. In ours, your Social Security dollars go to help fund the federal deficit. Thus the only assets of the Social Security trust fund are a log of federal I.O.U.s. The trust fund invests not a penny in productive assets. The average current return on that federal paper in the trust fund is around 8%. Had the money been invested in stocks, over the past 25 years the average return would have been more like 11.5% and the pensions would have been far more generous.

While you can't credit the entire advantage to its revamped social security system, Chile enjoys a wonderfully high savings rate, well over 20% of gross domestic product. Contrast that with the U.S.' abysmal 3.2%.

"Social Security has been a horrifically bad investment for Americans," says economist William Shipman, who co-chairs a study project on Social Security privatization financed by Washington's Cato Institute think tank.

"Social Security is the classic playout of a Ponzi pyramid scheme," says Borden. "There are only a few things you can do at this state. One is look for new suckers." His proposal would enable the younger suckers to escape.

Borden has nothing but scorn for the Social Security "reform" proposed in May by senators Bob Kerry and Alan Simpson. It would actually broaden the system by including state and local employees in Social Security. Affluent retirees--those earning in the top two-thirds--would have to keep paying into the fund. About the only advantage of this "reform" is that is strips away the pretense that Social Security payments are anything other than another federal tax.

A shift to a private system would not be without its problems. Pensions would be vulnerable to a stock market crash and to stock market booms and busts. People could lose their nest eggs by picking the wrong stocks at the wrong time. But averaged over time, the returns will fund higher benefits than pensions in the current system. Also, the private pension money would find its way into investment rather than into financing the federal deficit, and those investments could only raise productivity and the overall American standard of living.
Such reforms would not solve the problem of current retirees who have been promised benefits from money that has been, essentially, wasted by the government. Forbes columnist Steven Hanke has a partial solution for this: He says the federal government could sell off some of its huge land holdings and earmark the proceeds for funding the unfunded pensions. "We're not talking about Yosemite here, just the commercially used federal land. Old Faithful is not going on the block," Hanke assures those who worry about preserving the American wilderness.

But however we fund it, the money will have to be found. Says Borden: "That debt exists. Its' sunk cost. Whatever changes, we still owe people $12 trillion."

2.9.5 The Social Security Mess: A Way Out, (Reader's Digest, December 1995)

Last year, when a national poll asked adults ages 18 through 34 if they thought Social Security would provide for their retirement, only 28 percent said yes. A higher proportion, 46 percent, believed in UFOs.

This skepticism is not confined to young adults. The same poll revealed that half of the current Social Security recipients don't believe the program will exist when their grandchildren retire.

Unfortunately, the facts back them up. Government figures clearly show that the long-term financing of Social Security is not secure, and that the shoe will start pinching sooner than many people think.

The best-known reason for financing crisis is the huge baby-boom generation. Sometime between 2020 and 2015, the baby boomers will begin to retire, causing Social Security benefit expenditures to explode.

But the generation of workers that follows them—and is supposed to pay the taxes to finance the boomers' retirement—will be much smaller, thanks to the birth-control pill and the legalization of abortion. As a result, Social Security contributions will fall short of benefits.

**Rosy Assumption:** Given the advances in biotechnology, genetics and other medical fields, Americans will likely live longer in retirement. That's good news, but if 40 years from now the average baby boomer lives even a few more years than actuaries currently assume, Social Security financing will be overwhelmed.

In 1977 and 1982, the Social Security system faced bankruptcy. Both times, payroll taxes were hiked and benefits trimmed to keep the program afloat. The Social Security Administration's latest annual report indicates that in 2030 the SSA will run far short of the funds it needs to pay monthly benefits. By the time today's young workers retire, payroll-tax rates will have to almost double—to nearly 27 percent—to cover all the promised retirement benefits.

But even that may be too rosy a scenario. In projecting payroll-tax revenues, the SSA assumes that real wages will grow one percent per year. That's almost twice as fast as they've grown over the past 25 years. If more realistic numbers are used, retirement funds will run short in 2026, and payroll taxes will have to be almost tripled—to more than 40 percent—to cover SSA commitments.

"There is no prospect that today's younger workers will receive all the Social Security and Medicare benefits currently promised them," concludes former U.S. Social Security Commissioner Dorcas R. Hardy. "Without fundamental reforms, both programs will be bankrupt before these people retire."

**The Big Lie.** Because today's payroll taxes are projected to cover benefits for another 20 or 30 years, politicians would rather avoid facing the problem. There's only one hitch: the SSA's little-underground trust funds—the Old Age Survivors Insurance (OASDI) Trust Fund, which pays retirement benefits; the Disability Insurance (DI) Trust Fund, which pays disability benefits; and the Hospital Insurance (HI) Trust Fund, which pays Medicare hospitalization benefits.

When payroll taxes are collected from today's workers, the cash is deposited in these trust-fund accounts, then paid out as benefits to current retirees. Since 1983 these funds have accumulated huge surpluses. But the surpluses don't sit there waiting for rainy decades when revenues will fall short of payouts. Instead, the SSA lends the cash to the federal government in return for specially issued U.S. Treasury bonds. The trust funds hold these paper promises while the federal government spends the money.
But sometime in 2000, tax revenues for all three trust funds combined won't cover the programs' obligations, and the bonds will have to be cashed in. That's when everyone will learn that the federal government holds no cash or other assets to back up the trust-fund bonds. Where will it get the money? Only by increased federal borrowing and a bigger deficit, or by higher taxes and spending cuts. In other words, when the SSA reports a $1 trillion trust fund surplus, it doesn't mean the system is rolling in dough--it's rolling in IOUs signed by us taxpayers.

A Fool's Investment. In 2000, the SSA will "cash in" relatively few Treasury bonds, about $1 billion. But these redemptions will rise dramatically--to $51 billion in 2010 and $122 billion by 2015. To put that number in perspective, the entire annual federal deficit currently stands at about $200 billion.

But even that's not the whole story, Medicare will be a further strain, because only part of it (hospitalization) is paid by cashing in those IOUs we signed. The rest must be covered by Medicare's Supplementary Medical Insurance (SMI) program, which is bankrolled in part by--you guessed it--general tax revenues. By 2015 the combination of Social Security trust fund withdrawals and Medicare SMI would increase the federal deficit by a mind-boggling $270 billion. At that point, the taxes necessary to keep the system solvent could sink the economy.

The final irony is that even if all these future problems didn't exist, Social Security is still a bad deal for today's young workers. If you treated their payroll taxes as an investment, the real rate of return upon payment of benefits would be one percent or less. For many, the real return would be zero or even negative.

"At the average return earned on stocks or bonds over the past 45 years," notes Bill Shipman, a principal with State Street Global Advisors, one of the world's largest pension management investment firms, "Today's young workers would earn much higher benefits investing on their own rather than through Social Security."

Take an example from a study by the National Chamber Foundation: a couple entering the work force and earning average incomes in the mid 1980s. If they privately invested in the stock market all the payroll taxes they and their employer would otherwise have paid into Social Security--even at a mere four-percent return (just over half the stock-market performance over the past 70 years)--they would retire with a nest egg of more than $1 million in today's dollars. The interest alone from the nest egg would be higher than Social Security. The whole fund could be used to pay three times the benefits Social Security promises.

Low-income workers could be far better off too. According to Shipman, a low-income couple who put their payroll taxes into a modest-return bond fund would receive almost 50-percent more in benefits than they would get from Social Security.

A Proven Alternative. Last year the Bipartisan Commission on Entitlement and Tax Reform looked into the long-range fiscal ills of the Social Security. No single answer emerged, but the press focused mostly on a proposal by the commission's co-chairmen, Sen. Bob Kerrey (D., Neb.) and then-Senator John Danforth (R. Mo.), to sharply cut future benefits while maintaining today's payroll taxes.

These changes might solve the long-term financing problem, but they would make Social Security an even worse deal than it already is.

The one bright spot in the commission's hearings was a proposal to let workers shift their payroll taxes into personal investments similar to Individual Retirement Accounts (IRA).

To most Americans having grown up under Social Security, such a "privatized" pension program might seem hopelessly utopian. But one program of this type already exists--and flourishes--south of our border.

By the late 1970s, Chile's social security system had many of the same problems that beset ours today. Payroll taxes exceeded 26 percent, but the system had to be supplemented with large subsidies, ballooning the national deficit. That's when some U.S.-educated Chilean economists persuaded the government there was a way out of its social-security mess: allow workers to opt out of the government system and invest for retirement in IRAs. The plan was enacted in 1981.

Under its provisions, Chilean workers who enter the labor market or decide to leave the state-run system are required to put at least ten percent of their paycheck into an IRA managed by any of 21 authorized private investment companies. The companies are regulated to ensure at least a minimum in returns.
Chile's retirement age is 65 for men and 60 for women, but workers may retire earlier once they accumulate sufficient funds to pay a minimum level of benefits through extra, voluntary contributions or by higher-than-expected investment performance. Workers' accounts also fund the purchase of life, disability and health insurance. This private coverage replaces government benefits paid under the old system.

All benefits under Chile's private system are raised annually by a cost-of-living adjustment. This has been possible because the investments in the individual pension accounts have outpaced inflation. Unpaid benefits owed by the old system are covered by general tax revenues and the issuance of government bonds.

The Chilean experience shows it is possible to fulfill the obligations made to retirees in a government-run system while still letting workers move into a new privatized one—all without suffocatingly high taxes.

Chile's innovative system is highly popular—about 90 percent of workers are not in the new system, and it is expected that the government alternative will disappear in time. That's not surprising, since the old system collects up to about two-thirds more in taxes, yet ultimately pays back about 40 percent less.

Seizing on Chile's experience, Argentina and Peru are implementing private systems, and there is support for such reform in the United States as well. The same survey that showed such pessimism about the U.S. Social Security system found that young and old alike favor privatization far more than delaying the retirement age or scaling back benefits.

"Chile has demonstrated that a private option for Social Security can be highly successful and beneficial," says Norman Ture, former U.S. Undersecretary of the treasury, "We should begin seriously considering one ourselves."

2.10 They Told The Truth!: Amazing Quotes About the U.S. Government

2.10.1 About The Internal Revenue Service

"In a recent conversation with an official at the Internal Revenue Service, I was amazed when he told me that 'If the taxpayers of this country ever discover that the IRS operates on 90% bluff the entire system will collapse'".

[Henry Bellmon, Senator (1969)]

"... the key question is: can we define 'income' in a fair and reasonably straightforward manner? Unfortunately we have not yet succeeded in doing so".

[Shirley Peterson, former IRS Commissioner, April 1993]

"I don't like the income tax. Every time we talk about these taxes we get around to the idea of 'from each according to his capacity and to each according to his needs'. That's socialism. It's written into the Communist Manifesto. Maybe we ought to see that every person who gets a tax return receives a copy of the Communist Manifesto with it so he can see what's happening to him".


"Our federal tax system is, in short, utterly impossible, utterly unjust and completely counterproductive [it] reeks with injustice and is fundamentally un-American... it has earned a rebellion and it's time we rebelled".

[President Ronald Reagan, May 1983, Williamsburg, VA]

"If no information or return is filed, [the] Internal Revenue Service cannot assess you".

[Gary Makovski, Special IRS Agent, testifying under oath in U.S. v.Lloyd]

"Our tax system is based upon voluntary assessment and payment, not upon distraint".

[United States Supreme Court, in Flora v. United States]

"Our tax system is based on individual self-assessment and voluntary compliance".

[Mortimer Caplin, Internal Revenue Audit Manual (1975)]

"The United States has a system of taxation by confession".

20 Quotes courtesy of Gordon Phillips, National Director of reps for Save A Patriot Foundation (SAPF).
"The IRS is an extraordinary example of the end justifying the means. The majority, efficiency and fairness. To achieve that purpose, we will encourage and achieve the highest possible degree of voluntary compliance in accordance with the tax laws and regulations...".

-[Internal Revenue Manual, Chapter 1100, section 1111.1]

"Fear is the key element for the IRS in achieving its mission. Without fear, the IRS would have a difficult time maintaining our so-called system of voluntary compliance ...". "Given the opportunity, the IRS will take the easy way out and grab whatever it can... the IRS does not really care about you and what your future...... may be”.

-Santo Presti, former IRS Criminal Investigation Agent and author of "IRS In Action"

"The IRS is an extra ordinary example of the end justifying the means. The means of this agency is growth. It is interesting that the revenue officers within the IRS refer to taxpayers as 'inventory'. The IRS embodies the political realities of the selfish human desire to dominate others. Thus the end of this gigantic pretense of officialdom is power, pure and simple. The meek may inherit the earth, but they will never receive a promotion in an agency where efficiency is measured by the number of seizures of taxpayers' property and by the number of citizens and businesses driven into bankruptcy".

-[George Hansen, Congressman and author of "To Harass Our People"]

"I have sat on many a promotion panel where the first question of panel members was 'How many seizures have you made?'".

-[Joseph R. Smith, eight year IRS agent, testifying before Congress]

"The agency that is so strict on the way Americans keep their books cannot even pass a financial audit".

-[Ted Stevens, Republican Senator from Alaska]

"Eight decades of amendments... to [the] code have produced a virtually impenetrable maze... The rules are unintelligible to most citizens... The rules are equally mysterious to many government employees who are charged with administering and enforcing the law".

-[Shirley Peterson, Former IRS Commissioner, April 14, 1993 at Southern Methodist University]

"some techniques can be used only in connection with a full-scale program due to the nature of the tax situation and the need to avoid unnecessary taxpayer reaction. An example would be income tax returns compliance efforts aimed at the non-business taxpayer".

-[Internal Revenue Service Manual, Section 5221 "Returns Compliance Programs"]

"This [audit] was made extremely difficult because [IRS] existing Systems were not designed to provide reliable financial information... on their operations".

-[Comptroller Bowsher, Government Accountability Office, on the first-ever audit of the IRS in 1993]

"The wages of the average American worker, after inflation and taxes, have decreased 17% since 1973, the only Western industrial nation to so suffer".

-[Martin Gross, author of "The Tax Racket: Government Extortion From A to Z"]

2.10.2 …About Social Security
"When you pay social security taxes, you are in no way making provision for your own retirement. You are paying the pensions of those who are already retired. Once you understand this, you see that whether you will get the benefits you are counting on when you retire depends on whether Congress will levy enough taxes, borrow enough, or print enough money... [W. Allen Wallis, former Chairman of the 1975 Advisory Council on Social Security, May 27, 1976]

"There is no prospect that today's younger workers will receive all the Social Security and Medicare benefits currently promised them". [Dorcas Hardy, former Social Security Commissioner and author of "Social Insecurity", quoted in the December 1995 Reader's Digest]

'All we have to do now is to inform the public that the payment of social security taxes is voluntary and watch the mass exodus'. [Walter E. Williams, John M. Olin Distinguished Professor of Economics at George Mason University in Fairfax, VA, January 24, 1996]

2.10.3 ...About The Law

"The Constitution is a written instrument. As such it's meaning does not alter. That which it meant when adopted, it means now." [United States Supreme Court in South Carolina vs. United States (1905)]

"The Constitution prohibits any direct tax, unless in proportion to numbers as ascertained by the census... [and]... prohibits Congress from laying a direct tax on the revenue from property of the citizen without regard to state lines..." [United States Supreme Court in Pollock v. Farmers’ Loan & Trust Company (1895)]

"...[the 16th Amendment] conferred no new power of taxation...[and]... prohibited the... power of income taxation possessed by Congress from the beginning from being taken out of the category of indirect taxation to which it inherently belonged...". [United States Supreme Court in Stanton v. Baltic Mining Co., 240 U.S. 103 (1916)]

"To lay with one hand the power of government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it on favored individuals... is none the less robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms." [United States Supreme Court in Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 (1874)]

"...the intent of the lawmaker is to be found in the language that he has used". [United States Supreme Court in U.S. v. Goldberg (1897)]

"But the subpoena is in form an official command, and even though improvidently issued it has some coercive tendency, either because of ignorance of their rights on the part of those whom it purports to command or their natural respect for what appears to be an official command, or because of their reluctance to test the subpoena's validity by litigation." [United States Supreme Court in U.S. v. Minker, 350 U.S. 179 (1956) at 187]

"No State shall... coin money; emit bills of credit; make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts...". [United States Constitution, Article 1, Section 10, Clause 1]

"...bank records are not the depositor's private papers and having given the information to the bank, the depositor has no legitimate expectation of continued privacy... Records of an individual's accounts with banks are not the individual's private papers protected against compulsory production by the 4th Amendment, but instead are the business records of the banks". [United States Supreme Court in U.S. v. Miller, 425 U.S. 435 (1976) [paraphrased]]

"In questions of power, then, let no more be said of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution". [Thomas Jefferson]

2.10.4 ...About Money, Banking & The Federal Reserve
"100% of what is collected is absorbed solely by interest on the Federal Debt ... all individual income tax revenues are gone before one nickel is spent on the services taxpayers expect from government"
[Grace Commission report submitted to President Ronald Reagan on January 15, 1984]

"In 1833, a small group of Socialists met in London, announcing their intentions of converting the British economic system from capitalism to socialism. This group chose the name "Fabian Society". One of the leading members of the Fabian Society, author George Bernard Shaw, perhaps summed it up best when he said, quote: "... Socialism means equality of income or nothing... under socialism you would not be allowed to be poor. You would be forcibly fed, clothed, lodged, taught, and employed whether you like it or not. If it were discovered that you had not character enough to be worth all this trouble, you might possibly be executed in a kindly manner; but whilst you were permitted to live you would have to live well"
[Edgar Wallace Robinson in his 1980 booklet titled "Rolling Thunder"]

"Of all contrivances for cheating the laboring classes of mankind, none has been more effective than that which deludes them with paper money".
[Daniel Webster]

"All the perplexities, confusion and distress in America rise, not from defects in their Constitution or Confederation, not from want of honor or virtue, so much as from downright ignorance of the nature of coin, credit and circulation".
[John Adams, in a letter to Thomas Jefferson in 1787]

"Gold is still the ultimate store of wealth. It's the world's only true money. And there isn't much of it to go around. All of it ever mined would fit into a small building - a 56 foot cube. The annual world production would fit into a 14 foot cube, roughly the size of an ordinary living room. If each Chinese citizen were to buy just one ounce, it would take up the annual supply for the next 200 years".
[Mark Nestmann, author of "How To Achieve Personal And Financial Privacy In A Public Age]

"I see in the near future a crisis approaching. It unnerves me and causes me to tremble for the safety of my country... the Money Power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign" by working upon the prejudices of the people, until the wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in the midst of war."
[Abraham Lincoln, in a letter written to William Elkin just after the passage of the National Banking Act of 1863 and less than five months before he was assassinated]

"... the privilege of creating and issuing money... is the government's greatest creative opportunity... [saving] the taxpayers immense sums of money...".
[Abraham Lincoln]

"If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency first by inflation and then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up around them will deprive the people of all property until their children will wake up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered".
[Thomas Jefferson in 1802 in a letter to then Secretary of the Treasury, Albert Gallatin]

"I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies".
[Thomas Jefferson]

"Give me control over a nation's currency and I care not who makes its laws"
[Baron M.A. Rothschild (1744 - 1812)]

"Under the surface, the Rothschilds long had a powerful influence in dictating American financial laws. The law records show that they were powers in the old Bank of the United States [abolished by Andrew Jackson]."
[Gustav Myers, author of "History of the Great American Fortunes"]

"... You are a den of vipers and thieves. I intend to rout you out, and by the grace of the Eternal God, will rout you out".
[President Andrew Jackson, upon evicting a delegation of international bankers from the Oval Office]

"If Congress has the right under the Constitution to issue paper money, it was given to be used by themselves, not to be delegated to individuals or corporations".
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[Andrew Jackson]

"The few who can understand the system (Federal Reserve) will either be so interested in its profits, or so dependent on its favors, that there will be no opposition from that class, while on the other hand, the great body of the people, mentally incapable of comprehending the tremendous advantages that capital derives from the system, will bear its burdens without complaint and perhaps without even suspecting that the system is inimical to their interests."

[John Sherman, protégé of the Rothschild banking family, in a letter sent in 1863 to New York Bankers, Morton, and Gould, in support of the then proposed National Banking Act]

"... we conclude that the [Federal] Reserve Banks are not federal ... but are independent privately owned and locally controlled corporations... without day to day direction from the federal government."

[9th Circuit Court in Lewis v. United States, June 24, 1982]

"Some people think the Federal Reserve Banks are US government institutions They are not... they are private credit monopolies which prey upon the people of the US, for the benefit of themselves and their foreign and domestic swindlers, and rich and predatory money lenders. The sack of the United States by the Fed is the greatest crime in history. Every effort has been made by the Fed to conceal its powers, but the truth is the Fed has usurped the government. It controls everything here and it controls all our foreign relations. It makes and breaks governments at will."

[Congressman Charles McFadden, Chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee, June 10, 1932]

"when you or I write a check there must be sufficient funds in our account to cover that check, but when the Federal Reserve writes a check, it is creating money."

[Boston Federal Reserve Bank in a publication titled "Putting It Simply"]

"We make money the old fashioned way. We print it."

[Art Rolnick, former Chief Economist, Minneapolis Federal Reserve Bank]

"This is a staggering thought. We are completely dependent on the commercial Banks. Someone has to borrow every dollar we have in circulation, cash or credit. If the Banks create ample synthetic money we are prosperous; if not, we starve. We are absolutely without a permanent money system. When one gets a complete grasp of the picture, the tragic absurdity of our hopeless position is almost incredible, but there it is. It is the most important subject intelligent persons can investigate and reflect upon. It is so important that our present civilization may collapse unless it becomes widely understood and the defects remedied very soon."

[Robert Hemphill, Credit manager of Federal Reserve Bank in Atlanta.]

"Historically, the United States has been a hard money country. Only [since 1913] has the United States operated on a fiat money system. During this period, paper money has depreciated over 87%. During the preceding 140 year period, the hard currency of the United States had actually maintained its value. wholesale prices in 1913... were the same as in 1787."

[Kenneth Gerbino, former chairman of the American Economic Council]

"About all a Federal Reserve note can legally do is wipe out one debt and replace it with itself another debt, a note that promises nothing. If anything's been paid, the payment occurs only in the minds of the parties...".

[Tupper Saucy, author of "The Miracle On Main Street"]

"By a continuing process of inflation, governments can confiscate, secretly and unobserved, an important part of the wealth of their citizens. There is no subtler, no surer means of overturning the existing basis of society than to debase the currency. The process engages all the hidden forces of economic law on the side of destruction, and does it in a manner which not one man in a million is able to diagnose."

[John Maynard Keynes, economist and author of "The Economic Consequences Of The Peace"]

"Inflation has now been institutionalized at a fairly constant 5% per year. This has been determined to be the optimum level for generating the most revenue without causing public alarm. A 5% devaluation applies, not only to the money earned this year, but to all that is left over from previous years. At the end of the first year, a dollar is worth 95 cents. At the end of the second year, the 95 cents is reduced again by 5%, leaving its worth at 90 cents, and so on. By the time a person has worked 20 years, the government will have confiscated 64% of every dollar he saved over those years. By the time he has worked 45 years, the hidden tax will be 90%. The government will take virtually everything a person saves over a lifetime."

[G. Edward Griffin, historian and author of "The Creature From Jekyll Island"]
"The real truth of the matter is, and you and I know, that a financial element in the large centers has owned the government of the US. since the days of Andrew Jackson. History depicts Andrew Jackson as the last truly honorable and incorruptible American president".

[President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, November 23, 1933 in a letter to Colonel Edward Mandell House]

"...our system of credit is concentrated... in the hands of a few men... a power so organized, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that [we had] better not speak above [our] breath when [we] speak in condemnation of it... We have come to be... completely controlled... by... small groups of dominant men".

[President Woodrow Wilson]

"The Founding Fathers of this great land had no difficulty whatsoever understanding the agenda of bankers, and they frequently referred to them and their kind as, quote, 'friends of paper money. They hated the Bank of England, in particular, and felt that even were we successful in winning our independence from England and King George, we could never truly be a nation of freemen, unless we had an honest money system. Through ignorance, but moreover, because of apathy, a small, but wealthy, clique of power brokers have robbed us of our Rights and Liberties, and we are being raped of our wealth. We are paying the price for the near-comatose levels of complacency by our parents, and only God knows what might become of our children, should we not work diligently to shake this country from its slumber! Many a nation has lost its freedom at the end of a gun barrel, but here in America, we just decided to hand it over voluntarily. Worse yet, we paid for the tyranny and usurpation out of our own pockets with "voluntary" tax contributions and the use of a debt-laden fiat currency!".

[Peter Kershaw, author of the 1994 booklet "Economic Solutions"]

"Since I entered politics, I have chiefly had men's views confided to me privately. Some of the biggest men in the U.S., in the field of commerce and manufacturing, are afraid of somebody, are afraid of something. They know that there is a power somewhere so organized, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they had better not speak above their breath when they speak in condemnation of it."

[Woodrow Wilson - In his book entitled The New Freedom (1913)]

"The fact is that there is a serious danger of this country becoming a pluto-democracy; that is, a sham republic with the real government in the hands of a small clique of enormously wealthy men, who speak through their money, and whose influence, even today, radiates to every corner of the United States."

[William McAdoo - President Wilson's national campaign vice-chairman, wrote in Crowded years (1974)]

"The powers or financial capitalism had (a) far-reaching aim, nothing less than to create a world system of financial control in private hands able to dominate the political system of each country and the economy of the world as a whole. This system was to be controlled in a feudalist fashion by the central banks of the world acting in concert, by secret agreements arrived at in frequent meetings and conferences. The apex of the systems was to be the Bank for International Settlements in Basel, Switzerland, a private bank owned and controlled by the world's central banks which were themselves private corporations. Each central bank...sought to dominate its government by its ability to control Treasury loans, to manipulate foreign exchanges, to influence the level of economic activity in the country, and to influence cooperative politicians by subsequent economic rewards in the business world."

[Prof. Carroll Quigley in his book Tragedy and Hope ]

"In a small Swiss city sits an international organization so obscure and secretive...Control of the institution, the Bank for International Settlements, lies with some of the world's most powerful and least visible men: the heads of 32 central banks, officials able to shift billions of dollars and alter the course of economies at the stroke of a pen."

[Keith Bradsher of the New York Times, August 5, 1995]

"Banking was conceived in iniquity and was born in sin. The Bankers own the earth. Take it away from them, but leave them the power to create deposits, and with the flick of the pen they will create enough deposits to buy it back again. However, take it away from them, and all the great fortunes like mine will disappear and they ought to disappear, for this would be a happier and better world to live in. But, if you wish to remain the slaves of Bankers and pay the cost of your own slavery, let them continue to create deposits."

[Sir Josiah Stamp - President of the Bank of England in the 1920's, and the second richest man in Britain]

"The Federal Reserve Bank of New York is eager to enter into close relationship with the Bank for International Settlements....The conclusion is impossible to escape that the State and Treasury Departments are willing to pool the banking
system of Europe and America, setting up a world financial power independent of and above the Government of the United States....The United States under present conditions will be transformed from the most active of manufacturing nations into a consuming and importing nation with a balance of trade against it."

[Rep. Louis McFadden - (Chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency) quoted in the New York Times (June 1930)]

"(The Great Depression resulting from the Stock Market crash) was not accidental. It was a carefully contrived occurrence....The international bankers sought to bring about a condition of despair here so they might emerge as rulers of us all."

[Rep. McFadden testified in Congress (1933). There were at least two attempts on his life by gunfire. He died of suspected poisoning after attending a banquet]

"The Federal Reserve (Banks) are one of the most corrupt institutions the world has ever seen. There is not a man within the sound of my voice who does not know that this Nation is run by the International Bankers."

[Rep. Louis McFadden]

"Whoever controls the volume of money in any country is absolute master of all commerce and industry."

[President James A. Garfield]

"History shows that the money changers have used every form of abuse, intrigue, deceit and violent means possible to maintain control over governments by controlling the money and the issuance of it."

[President James A. Madison]

"Nothing did more to spur the boom in stocks than the decision made by the New York Federal Reserve bank, in the spring of 1927, to cut the rediscount rate. Benjamin Strong, Governor of the bank, was chief advocate of this unwise measure, which was taken largely at the behest of Montagu Norman of the Bank of England....At the time of the Banks action I warned of its consequences....I felt that sooner or later the market had to break."

[Money baron Bernard Baruch in Baruch: The Public Years (1960)]

"Thus corporations finally claimed the full rights enjoyed by individual citizens while being exempted from many of the responsibilities and liabilities of citizenship. Furthermore, in being guaranteed the same right to free speech as individual citizens, they achieved, in the words of Paul Hawken, 'precisely what the Bill of Rights was intended to prevent: domination of public thought and discourse.' The subsequent claim by corporations that they have the same right as any individual to influence the government in their own interest pits the individual citizen against the vast financial and communications resources of the corporation and mocks the constitutional intent that all citizens have an equal voice in the political debates surrounding important issues."

[David C. Korten, in his book, When Corporations Rule the World ]

"Give me control over a man's economic actions, and hence over his means of survival, and except for a few occasional heroes, I'll promise to deliver to you men who think and write and behave as I want them to."

[Benjamin A. Rooge]

" The Federal Reserve Bank is nothing but a banking fraud and an unlawful crime against civilization. Why? Because they "create" the money made out of nothing, and our Uncle Sap Government issues their "Federal Reserve Notes" and stamps our Government approval with NO obligation whatever from these Federal Reserve Banks, Individual Banks or National Banks, etc.

[H.L. Birum, Sr. American Mercury, August 1957, p. 43]

"I consider the foundation of the Constitution as laid on this ground that "all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are preserved to the states or to the people.

" ... To take a single step beyond the boundaries thus specially drawn around the powers of Congress is to take possession of a boundless field of power, no longer susceptible of any definition. The incorporation of a bank, and the powers assumed by this bill (chartering the first Bank of the United States), have not, been delegated to the United States by the Constitution."

[Thomas Jefferson - in opposition to the chartering of the first Bank of the United States (1791)]
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"The money power preys on the nation in times of peace, and conspires against it in times of adversity. It is more despotic than monarchy, more insolent than autocracy, more selfish than bureaucracy. It denounces, as public enemies, all who question its methods or throw light upon its crimes."

[Abraham Lincoln]

"Whoever controls the volume of money in any country is absolute master of all industry and commerce."

[President James A. Garfield]

These statements were made during hearings of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, September 30, 1941. Members of the Federal Reserve Board call themselves "Governors". Governor Eccles was Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board at the time of these hearings.

Congressman Patman: "How did you get the money to buy those two billion dollars' worth of Government securities in 1933?"

Governor Eccles: "Out of the right to issue credit money."

Patman: "And there is nothing behind it, is there, except our Government's credit?"

Eccles: "That is what our money system is. If there were no debts in our money system, there wouldn't be any money."

Congressman Fletcher: "Chairman Eccles, when do you think there is a possibility of returning to a free and open market, instead of this pegged and artificially controlled financial market we now have?"

Governor Eccles: "Never, not in your lifetime or mine."

Statements made during hearings of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, 1947.

"Mr. Speaker, we are now in Chapter 11... Members of Congress are official trustees presiding over the greatest reorganization of any bankrupt entity in world history."

[James Trafficant, Congressman, March 17, 1993 in the Congressional Record]

2.10.5  ...About the New World Order

"The individual is handicapped by coming face to face with a conspiracy so monstrous he cannot believe it exists."

[J. Edgar Hoover, former head of the FBI]

"Every child in American who enters school with an allegiance toward our elected officials, toward our founding fathers, toward our institutions, toward the preservation of this form of government... all of this proves the children are sick, because the truly well individual is one who has rejected all of those things and is what I would call the true international child of the future."

[Chester M. Pierce, Harvard University psychiatrist, at a 1973 International Education Seminar, as quoted in "Educating For The New World Order" by B.K. Eakman]

"The C.F.R. [Council On Foreign Relations, New York City] is the American Branch of a society which originated in England and believes national directives should be obliterated and one-world rule established. I know of the operations of this network because I have studied it for twenty years, and was permitted in the early 1960's to examine its papers and secret records... I believe its role in history is significant enough to be known."

[Dr. Carroll Quigley, Professor of International Relations, Georgetown University Foreign Service School, Washington, D.C., author of the epic "Tragedy & Hope", advocate of one-world government and personal mentor of President William Clinton (who acknowledged Professor Quigley during his 1992 presidential inauguration speech)]

"We shall have world government whether or not we like it. The only question is whether World government will be achieved by conquest or consent."

[James Paul Warburg, Chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations, 1921 - 1932, before the U.S. Senate, February 17, 1950]

"To achieve world government, it is necessary to remove from the minds of men, their individualism, loyalty to family traditions, national patriotism and religious dogmas."

[Brock Chisolm, former Director of the World Health Organization]

"The main purpose of the Council on Foreign Relations is promoting the disarmament of U.S. sovereignty and national independence and submergence into an all-powerful, one world government."

[Chester Ward, Rear Admiral and former Navy Judge Advocate 1956 - 1960 and C.F.R. member for 15 years]
"The real rulers in Washington are invisible and exercise power from behind the scenes."
[Felix Frankfurter, United States Supreme Court Justice]

"We operate here under directives from the White House. [to] use our grant making power to alter life in the US. so that we can comfortably be merged with the Soviet Union".
[Rowan Gaither, former president of the Ford Foundation, in a 1954 statement to Norman Dodd regarding Congressional investigations of the un-American activities of tax-exempt foundations operating in the U.S.]

"Gentlemen, Comrades, do not be concerned about all you hear about glasnost and perestroika and democracy in the coming years These are primarily for outward consumption. There will be no significant internal change within the Soviet Union, other than for cosmetic purposes. Our purpose is to disarm the Americans and let them fall asleep".
[Mikhail Gorbachev, former President of the Soviet Union, to the Politburo in November of 1987]

"In politics, nothing happens by accident. If it happens, it was planned that way".
[Franklin D. Roosevelt]

"I believe that if the people of this nation fully understood what Congress has done to them over past forty-nine years, they would move on Washington. It adds up to a preconceived plan to destroy the economic and social independence of the United States".
[Senator George Malone of Nevada, speaking before Congress in 1957]

"America will never be destroyed from the outside. If we falter and lose our freedoms, it will be because we destroyed ourselves"
[Abraham Lincoln]

"The American people will never knowingly adopt socialism. But, under the name of "liberalism", they will adopt every fragment of the socialist program, until one day America will be a socialist nation, without knowing how it happened".
[Norman Thomas, for many years the U.S. Socialist Party presidential candidate]

'America is like a healthy body and its resistance is threefold: its patriotism, its morality and its spiritual life. If we can undermine these three areas, America will collapse from within".
[Joseph Stalin, former dictator of the Soviet Union]

2.10.6 About the "Watchdog Media"

"We are grateful to The Washington Post, the New York Times, Time Magazine and other great publications whose directors have attended our meetings and respected their promise of discretion for almost forty years... It would have been impossible for us to develop our plan for the world if we had been subject to the bright lights of publicity during those years. But, the world is now more sophisticated and prepared to march towards a world government. The supranational sovereignty of an intellectual elite and world bankers is surely preferable to the national auto determination practiced in past centuries".
[David Rockefeller, in an address given to Catherine Graham, publisher of The Washington Post and other media luminaries in attendance in Baden, Germany at the June 1991 annual meeting of the world elite Bilderberg Group]

"There is no such thing, at this date of the world's history in America, as an independent press You know it and I know it. There is not one of you who dare to write your honest opinions, and if you did, you know beforehand that it would never appear in print. I am paid weekly for keeping my honest opinion out of the paper I am connected with. Others of you are paid similar salaries for similar things, and any of you who would be so foolish as to write honest opinions would be out on the street looking for another job. If I allowed my honest opinions to appear in one issue of my' paper, before twenty-four hours my occupation would be gone. The business of the journalist is to destroy the truth; to lie outright; to pervert; to vilify; to fawn at the feet of mammon, and to sell his country and his race for his daily bread. You know it and I know it and what folly is this toasting an independent press? We are the tools and vassals of rich men behind the scenes We are the jumping jacks, they pull the strings and we dance. Our talents, our possibilities, and our lives are all the property of other men. We are intellectual prostitutes.
[John Swinton, Former Chief of Staff for the New York Times, 1953, in a 1953 speech before the New York Press Club. Some of our members have provided evidence about the credibility of this quote, so take it with a grain of salt]
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"We are going to impose our agenda on the coverage by dealing with issues and subjects that we choose to deal with".
Richard M. Cohen, former Senior Producer of CBS political news

"Our job is to give people not what they want, but what we decide they ought to have"
Richard Salant, former President of CBS News

2.10.7 About Republic v. Democracy

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of American, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
United States Pledge of Allegiance

"Democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths".
James Madison

"Democracy is a form of government that cannot long survive, for as soon as the people learn that they have a voice in the fiscal policies of the government, they will move to vote for themselves all the money in the treasury, and bankrupt the nation".
Karl Marx, 1848 author of "The Communist Manifesto"

"Liberty has never lasted long in a democracy, nor has it ever ended in anything better than despotism".
Fisher Ames (1758 - 1808)

2.10.8 About Citizens, Politicians and Government

"If ever time should come, when vain and aspiring men shall possess the highest seats in Government, our country will stand in need of its experienced patriots to prevent its ruin."
Samuel Adams

"It is not the function of our government to keep the citizen from falling into error; it is the function of the citizen to keep the government from falling into error"
United States Supreme Court - American Communications Association v. Douds

"Our government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by example. Crime is contagious. If the government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for the law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself".
Louis D. Brandeis, former Supreme Court Justice

"It is inherent in government's right, if necessary, to lie... that seems to me basic - basic".
Arthur Sylvester, former Assistant Secretary of Defense

2.10.9 About Liberty, Slavery, Truth, Rights & Courage

"None are more hopelessly enslaved than those who falsely believe they are free."
Johann W. Von Goethe

"Fear can only prevail when victims are ignorant of the facts ".
Thomas Jefferson

"He who knows nothing is nearer to the truth than he whose mind is filled with falsehoods and errors".
Thomas Jefferson

"They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."
Benjamin Franklin

"In the beginning of a change, the patriot is a scarce man; brave, hated, and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot."
Chapter 2: U.S. Government Background

2.11 Evidence of How Our System Has Been Corrupted and what we need to fix

We will now give you a few anecdotes and pearls of wisdom that help reveal from a spiritual perspective why our system of government in the United States of America has become totally corrupted and unrecognizable from its de jure Constitutional foundations. This will help us focus in later chapters upon what we need to fix and how we need to fix it.

2.11.1 The Bill of No Rights

"We, the sensible people of the United States, in an attempt to help everyone get along, restore some semblance of Justice, avoid any more riots, keep our country safe, promote positive behavior, and secure the blessings of debt-free liberty to ourselves and our great-great-grandchildren, hereby try one more time to ordain and establish some common sense guidelines for the terminally whiny, guilt-ridden, deluded, and other liberal Bed-wetters.

[Samuel Clemens, author who wrote under the nom de plume, Mark Twain]

"The true danger is when liberty is nibbled away, for expedients, and by parts... the only thing necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing."
[Edmund Burke]

"The right to freedom being the gift of God, it is not in the power of man to alienate this gift and voluntarily become a slave".
[Samuel Adams]

"Single acts of tyranny may be ascribed to the accidental opinion of a day. But a series of oppressions, pursued unalterably through every change of ministers, too plainly proves a deliberate systematic plan of reducing us to slavery".
[Thomas Jefferson]

"I have never seen more Senators express discontent with their jobs ... we have been accomplices to doing something terrible and unforgivable to this wonderful country... we have given our children a legacy of bankruptcy. We have defrauded our country to get ourselves elected".
[John Danforth, Republican Senator from Missouri, in an interview in The Arizona Republic on April 22, 1992]

"You have rights antecedent to all earthly governments; rights that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws; rights derived from the Great Legislator of the Universe".
[John Adams]

"To sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards of men."
[Abraham Lincoln]

"Any truth is better than make-believe... rather than love, than money than fame, give me truth"
[Henry David Thoreau]

'Most people, sometime in their lives, stumble across truth. Most jump up, brush themselves off, and hurry on about their business as if nothing had happened."
[Winston Churchill]

"I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves, and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion".
[Thomas Jefferson]

"The war against illegal plunder has been fought since the beginning of the world. But how is... legal plunder to be identified? Quite simply. See if the law takes from some persons what belongs to them, and gives it to other persons to whom it does not belong. See if the law benefits one citizen at the expense of another by doing what the citizen himself cannot do without committing a crime. Then abolish this law without delay ...... If such a law is not abolished immediately it will spread, multiply and develop into a system".
[Frederic Bastiat, French author of "The Law" (1848)]
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We hold these truths to be self-evident: that a whole lot of people are confused by the Bill of Rights and are so dim that they require a Bill of No Rights."

**ARTICLE I**: You do not have the right to a new car, big screen TV or any other form of wealth. More power to you if you can legally acquire them, but no one is guaranteeing anything.

**ARTICLE II**: You do not have the right to never be offended. This country is based on freedom, and that means freedom for everyone - not just you! You may leave the room, change the channel, express a different opinion, etc., but the world is full of idiots, and probably always will be.

**ARTICLE III**: You do not have the right to be free from harm. If you stick a screwdriver in your eye, learn to be more careful. Do not expect the tool manufacturer to make you and all your relatives independently wealthy.

**ARTICLE IV**: You do not have the right to free food and housing. Americans are the most charitable people to be found, and will gladly help anyone in need, but we are quickly growing weary of subsidizing generation after generation of professional couch potatoes who achieve nothing more than the creation of another generation of professional couch potatoes.

**ARTICLE V**: You do not have the right to free health care. That would be nice, but from the looks of public housing, we're just not interested in public health care.

**ARTICLE VI**: You do not have the right to physically harm other people. If you kidnap, rape, intentionally maim, or kill someone, don't be surprised if the rest of us want to see you fry in the electric chair.

**ARTICLE VII**: You do not have the right to the possessions of others. If you rob, cheat or coerce away the goods or services of other citizens, don't be surprised if the rest of us get together and lock you away in a place where you still won't have the right to a big screen color TV or a life of leisure.

**ARTICLE VIII**: You don't have the right to demand that our children risk their lives in foreign wars to soothe your aching conscience. We hate oppressive governments and won't lift a finger to stop you from going to fight if you'd like. However, we do not enjoy parenting the entire world and do not want to spend so much of our time battling each and every little tyrant with a military uniform and a funny hat.

**ARTICLE IX**: You don't have the right to a job. All of us sure want all of you to have one, and will gladly help you along in hard times, but we expect you to take advantage of the opportunities of education and vocational training laid before you to make yourself useful.

**ARTICLE X**: You do not have the right to happiness. Being an American means that you have the right to pursue happiness -- which, by the way, is a lot easier if you are unencumbered by an overabundance of idiotic laws created by those of you who were confused by the Bill of Rights.

2.11.2 **Am I A Bad American?-Absolutely NOT!**

Someone sent us this via email and we think it is so insightful and so descriptive about our social responsibilities here in America, we wanted to share it with all of you:

**AM I A BAD AMERICAN?...I'M THINKING NOT!**

I believe the money I make belongs to me and my family, not some middle-aged governmental functionary with a bad comb-over who wants to give it away to crack addicts making babies so that I can help support them.

I don't care about appearing compassionate. I already support causes that I believe are worthwhile, charitable, educational, and religious. I don't need any liberal minion on the government payroll to tell me how, when, or where I need to show compassion.

I think I'm doing better than the homeless and I absolutely should not feel guilty about it.

I don't think being a minority makes you noble nor victimized.
I don’t think playing with toy guns makes you a killer.

I believe it’s called the Boy Scouts for a reason.

I have the right not to be tolerant of others. There are a lot of screwed up people out there; card-carrying members of the largest cult in society - dysfunction. As long as I’m responsible for me and my own legal behavior, I don’t have to tolerate those assholes, no matter their race, creed, or color.

I like big houses, cars, boats, and planes.

I believe that if you are selling me Dairy Queen ice cream, a KFC box of chicken, or a hotel room - you do it in English. As a matter of fact, if you are going to live in this country, you should learn to read and speak English. That would be the civil thing to do. English happens to also be the dominant language on the Internet. Gee, I wonder why? Our ancestors did not have to die in vain so that someone could leave the country they were born in to come here and disrespect ours.

I think the cops have every right to shoot your sorry ass if you’re running from them after they tell you to stop. If you can’t understand the word “freeze,” or “stop!” in English, see the previous line.

I don’t use the excuse “it’s for the children” as a shield for stupid opinions or actions.

If I received oral sex from one of my subordinate employees in my office, it wouldn’t be "a private matter" or my "personal business." I would have been FIRED immediately.

I know what the definition of lying is. I know what the definition of “is” is, too...

I don’t think that just because you were not born in this country, you qualify for some special loan program, government sponsored bank loan, etc., so you can open a hotel, convenience store, trinket shop, or anything else. That is bullshit.

I believe that no one ever died because of something Ozzy Osbourne, Eminem or Marilyn Manson sang, but that doesn’t mean I want to listen to that crap from someone else’s car when I’m stopped at a red light. But I respect your right to be really stupid.

I don’t think that being a student gives you any more enlightenment than working at Blockbuster Video or Jack In The Box.

We did not go to some foreign country and risk lives in vain to defend our constitution so that decades later you can tell us it’s a living document ever changing and is open to interpretation.

I don’t hate the rich. If they invented it, built it, sold it, and/or serviced it - I respect them. The only rich I cannot respect are those who inherited it.

I don’t pity the poor.

I’ve never owned a slave. Neither did my father, or his father, or his father, etc. If you go back far enough you can find shitty circumstances that impacted most of our predecessors’ lives. Get over it. Equal opportunity means you do the same and you get the same - not you do less and expect more.

I believe a self-righteous liberal with a cause is more dangerous than an armed Hell’s Angel with an attitude.

I own a gun, you can own a gun, and any red blooded American should be allowed to own a gun, but if you use it in a crime then you will serve the time. Not probation and not a plea bargain - you serve time. And clean up our highways while you do the time. By the way, a rubber band and a sharp paper clip is a dangerous weapon in the hands of someone with malicious intent.

I worry about dying before I get even.

I think Bill Gates has every right to keep every penny he made and continue to make more. If it pisses you off, invent something better and put your name on the building.

We don’t need more laws! Let’s enforce the ones we already have.

It doesn’t take a village to raise a child, it takes a parent with the balls to stand up to the kid and spank his butt and say “NO!” Discipline means to instruct, correct and punish. Good parents do that.
2.11.3 How to Teach Your Child About Politics

Because I write about politics, people are forever asking me the best way to teach children how our system of government works. I tell them that they can give their own children a basic civics course right in their own homes. In my own experience as a father, I have discovered several simple devices that can illustrate to a child's mind the principles on which the modern state deals with its citizens. You may find them helpful, too.

For example, I used to play the simple card game WAR with my son. After a while, when he thoroughly understood that the higher ranking cards beat the lower ranking ones, I created a new game I called GOVERNMENT. In this game, I was Government, and I won every trick, regardless of who had the better card. My boy soon lost interest in my new game, but I like to think it taught him a valuable lesson for later in life.

When your child is a little older, you can teach him about our tax system in a way that is easy to grasp. Offer him, say, $10 to mow the lawn. When he has mowed it and asks to be paid, withhold $5 and explain that this is income tax. Give $1 to his younger brother, and tell him that this is "fair". Also, explain that you need the other $4 yourself to cover the administrative costs of dividing the money. When he cries, tell him he is being "selfish" and "greedy". Later in life he will thank you.

Make as many rules as possible. Leave the reasons for them obscure. Enforce them arbitrarily. Accuse your child of breaking rules you have never told him about. Keep him anxious that he may be violating commands you haven't yet issued. Instill in him the feeling that rules are utterly irrational. This will prepare him for living under democratic government.

When your child has matured sufficiently to understand how the judicial system works, set a bedtime for him and then send him to bed an hour early. When he tearfully accuses you of breaking the rules, explain that you made the rules and you can interpret them in any way that seems appropriate to you, according to changing conditions. This will prepare him for the Supreme Court's concept of the U.S. Constitution as a "living document". Promise often to take him to the movies or the zoo, and then, at the appointed hour, recline in an easy chair with a newspaper and tell him you have changed your plans. When he screams, "But you promised!", explain to him that it was a campaign promise. Every now and then, without warning, slap your child. Then explain that this is defense. Tell him that you must be vigilant at all times to stop any potential enemy before he gets big enough to hurt you. This, too, your child will appreciate, not right at that moment, maybe, but later in life. At times your child will naturally express discontent with your methods. He may even give voice to a petulant wish that he lived with another family. To forestall and minimize this reaction, tell him how lucky he is to be with you the most loving and indulgent parent in the world, and recount lurid stories of the cruelties of other parents. This will make him loyal to you and, later, receptive to schoolroom claims that the America of the postmodern welfare state is still the best and freest country on Earth.

This brings me to the most important child-rearing technique of all: lying. Lie to your child constantly. Teach him that words mean nothing - or rather that the meanings of words are continually "evolving", and may be tomorrow the opposite of what they are today.

Some readers may object that this is a poor way to raise a child. A few may even call it child abuse. But that's the whole point: Child abuse is the best preparation for adult life under our form of GOVERNMENT.

---

21 Joseph Sobran.
That having been said, let’s compare what the Supreme Court has to say about this kind of despicable behavior by the government:

“Decency, Security, and liberty alike demand that government officials shall be subjected to the same rules of conduct that are commands to the citizen. In a government of laws, existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. Our government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for the law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy. To declare that in the administration of the criminal law the end justifies the means...would bring terrible retribution. Against that pernicious doctrine this Court should resolutely set its face.”

[Justice Brandeis, Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 485 (1928)]

2.11.4 If Noah Were Alive Today

And the Lord spoke to Noah and said, "In one year, I am going to make it Rain and cover the whole earth with water until all flesh is destroyed.

But I want you to save the righteous people and two of every kind of living Thing on the earth. Therefore, I am commanding you to build an Ark." In a flash of lightening, God delivered the specifications for an Ark. In fear and trembling, Noah took the plans and agreed to build the Ark. "Remember" said the Lord, "You must complete the Ark and bring everything aboard in one year." Exactly one-year later, fierce storm clouds covered the earth and all the seas of the earth went into a tumult. The Lord saw that Noah was sitting in his front yard weeping. “CHRISTIANS:Noah”, He shouted. "Where is the Ark?"

"Lord, please forgive me!" cried Noah. "I did my best, but there were big problems. First, I had to get a permit for construction and your plans did not meet the codes. I had to hire an engineering firm and redraw the plans.

Then I got into a fight with OSHA over whether or not the Ark needed a Fire sprinkler system and floatation devices. Then my neighbor objected, claiming I was violating zoning ordinances by building the Ark in my front yard, so I had to get a variance from the city planning commission. Then I had problems getting enough wood for the Ark, because there was a ban on cutting trees to protect the Spotted Owl. I finally convinced the US Forest Service that I needed the wood to save the owls. However, the Fish and Wildlife Service won't let me catch any owls. So, no owls. The carpenters formed a union and went out on strike. I had to negotiate a settlement with the National Labor Relations Board before anyone would pick up a saw or a hammer. Now I have 16 carpenters on the Ark, but still no owls.

When I started rounding up the other animals, I was sued by an animal rights group. They objected to me only taking two of each kind aboard. Just when I got the suit dismissed, the EPA notified me that I could not complete the Ark without filing an Environmental impact statement on your proposed flood. They didn't take me kindly to The idea that they had no jurisdiction over the conduct of the Creator of The universe. Then the Army Engineers demanded a map of the proposed new Flood plain. I sent them a globe. Right now, I am trying to resolve a Complaint filed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission that I am practicing discrimination by not taking godless, unbelieving people aboard.

The IRS has seized my assets, claiming that I'm building the Ark in preparation to Flee the country to avoid paying taxes. I just got a notice from the state that I owe them some kind of user tax and failed to register the Ark as a "recreational water craft." Finally, the ACLU (the American Communist Lawyers Union) got the courts to issue an injunction against further construction of the Ark, saying that since God is flooding the earth, it is a religious event and therefore, unconstitutional. I really don't think I can finish the Ark for another five or six years." Noah wailed. The sky began to clear; the sun began to shine and the seas began to calm. A rainbow arched across the sky. Noah looked up hopefully.

"You mean You are not going to destroy the earth Lord?"

"No," said the Lord sadly. "I don't have to. The government already has."

2.11.5 Prayer at the Opening of the Kansas Senate

When minister Joe Wright was asked to open the new session of the Kansas Senate, everyone was expecting the usual politically correct generalities, but what they heard instead was a stirring prayer, passionately calling our country to repentance and righteousness.
The response was immediate. A number of legislators walked out during the prayer in protest. In six short weeks, the Central Christian Church had logged more than 5,000 phone calls with only 47 of those calls responding negatively. The church is now receiving international requests for copies of the prayer from India, Africa and Korea.

Commentator PAUL HARVEY aired the prayer on *The Rest of the Story* on the radio and received a larger response to this program than any other he has ever aired!

**THE PRAYER**

*Heavenly Father, we come before you today to ask Your forgiveness and to seek Your direction and guidance.*

*We know Your Word says, “Woe on those who call evil good,” but that's exactly what we have done. We have lost our spiritual equilibrium and reversed our values. We confess that:*

*We have ridiculed the absolute truth of Your Word and called it pluralism.*

*We have worshiped other gods and called it multiculturalism.*

*We have endorsed perversion and called it an alternative lifestyle.*

*We have exploited the poor and called it the lottery.*

*We have neglected the needy and called it self-preservation.*

*We have rewarded laziness and called it welfare.*

*We have killed our unborn children and called it a choice.*

*We have shot abortionists and called it justifiable.*

*We have neglected to discipline our children and called it building self-esteem.*

*We have abused power and called it political savvy.*

*We have coveted our neighbor's possessions and called it ambition.*

*We have polluted the air with profanity and pornography and called it freedom of expression.*

*We have ridiculed the time-honored values of our forefathers and called it enlightenment.*

*Search us, O God, and know our hearts today; cleanse us from every sin and set us free. Guide and bless these men and women who have been sent to direct us to the center of Your will. I ask it in the name of Your Son, the living Savior, Jesus Christ. Amen.*

2.11.6 **The Ghost of Valley Forge**
I had a dream the other night I didn't understand,
A figure walking through the mist, with flintlock in his hand.

His clothes were torn and dirty, as he stood there by my bed,
He took off his three-cornered hat, and speaking low he said:

"We fought a revolution to secure our liberty,
We wrote the Constitution, as a shield from tyranny.

For future generations, this legacy we gave,
In this, the land of the free and home of the brave.

The freedom we secured for you, we hoped you'd always keep,
But tyrants labored endlessly while your parents were asleep.

Your freedom gone -- your courage lost -- you're no more than a slave,
In this, the land of the free and the home of the brave.

You buy permits to travel, and permits to own a gun,
Permits to start a business, or to build a place for one.

On land that you believe you own, you pay a yearly rent,
Although you have no voice in choosing how the money's spent.

Your children must attend a school that doesn't educate,
Your moral values can't be taught, according to the state.

You read about the current "news" in a very biased press,
You pay a tax you do not owe, to please the IRS.

Your money is no longer made of silver or of gold,
You trade your wealth for paper, so life can be controlled.

You pay for crimes that make our Country turn from God to shame,
You've taken Satan's number, as you've traded in your name.
You've given government control to those who do you harm,
So they can padlock churches, and steal the family farm.

And keep our country deep in debt, put men of God in jail,
Harass your fellow countryman while corrupted courts prevail.

Your public servants don't uphold the solemn oath they've sworn,
Your daughters visit doctors so children won't be born.

Your leaders ship artillery and guns to foreign shores,
And send your sons to slaughter, fighting other people's wars.

Can you regain your Freedom for which we fought and died?
Or don't you have the courage, or the faith to stand with pride?

Are there no more values for which you'll fight to save?
Or do you wish your children live in fear and be a slave?

Sons of the Republic, arise and take a stand!
Defend the Constitution, the Supreme Law of the Land!

Preserve our Republic, and each God-given right!
And pray to God to keep the torch of freedom burning bright!

As I awoke he vanished, in the mist from whence he came,
His words were true, we are not free, and we have ourselves to blame.

For even now as tyrants trample each God-given right,
We only watch and tremble -- too afraid to stand and fight.

If he stood by your bedside in a dream while you're asleep,
And wonder what remains of your right he fought to keep.

What would be your answer if he called out from the grave?
Is this still the land of the free and home of the brave?

2.11.7 **Last Will and Testament of Jesse Cornish**

“A good man leaves an inheritance to his Children’s children, but the wealth of the sinner is stored up for the righteous.”

[Prov. 13:22, Bible, NKJV]

---

**Last Will and Testament**

**Of**

**Jesse Franklin Cornish**

I, Jesse Cornish, being of sound mind, do of my own accord, make this last will, bequeathing all of my earthly possessions as follows:

To my son, Jesse, and my daughter, Candy, I leave all my owned real estate and equities and all my liquid assets in the form of checking, savings, and other money accounts to share and share alike.

To my son, Jesse, I leave my guns, fishing gear, boats and all other personal effects a father would normally pass on to his son.
To my daughter, Candy, I leave the things her mother left. I leave her also certain family treasures, and pieces or collected art described on the attached sheets.

To both my son, Jesse, and my daughter, Candy, I leave my total collection of African art goods, my automobiles, items of jewelry, photographs, music albums, and all household valuables to share and share alike.

To my grandchildren, I leave the faith and hope that your parents will pass on to you whatever is left of this bequest on their demise. And to this I pray that they will add their lot. The bequests I have named appear in the will that is it be probated. It is already in the hands of my lawyers who will see it through for you.

In your own safe-deposit boxes, where you found this private copy is a sealed letter addressed to each of you. You may open it now. Inside you will find specific instructions leading you to the location of special forms of assets I have secured and left for you. This wealth may well be the only thing of real value I have to pass on to you.

It is in the form of gold and silver coins and bullion. Nobody knows I bought it, there is no record of them, and nobody knows where they are except you today.

I did not buy it to speculate. I bought it to get out of paper assets and to preserve capital.

The bullion coins are worth five times what I paid for them and some or the numismatic coins have appreciated over 6000 percent in the last ten years. As the next inflationary cycle reaches double digit, their values will also double.

The numismatic, rare coins along with their certification are in the packets here that bear your names. In your names also are these storage receipts from the warehouses in Montreal and Dallas. They represent the numerous pieces of fine ivory and ebony art carvings I brought out of Africa over the years. You may claim them in person at any time. All of these items are in demand and maintain high liquidity.

I depart this life with the prayer that you will have the foresight and self-discipline to leave it as it is until this country regains fiscal sanity. When that finally comes about, there will be complete monetary reform.

Your gold, silver, and ivory will buy this new form of currency and could well be your only hope for financial survival. When I purchased the uncirculated coins to put away for you, I was afraid and didn’t buy enough. Now I see they have provided the highest appreciation of all, and any further additions to this private part of my bequests to you will include more of the same.

It grieves me to inform you that I have also passed on to you a “Legacy of Debt.”

My generation found a way to lead the good life by borrowing from yours. We have lived out the last thirty years in a credit “dream world” of luxury and affluence and monetized the massive debt by offering the next two generations as collateral. The material wealth I leave to you will not even begin to pay your share of the bill we ran up during your lifetime and it will haunt you and cause you to ask, “How could my dad do this?”

Please know it was not what I did, but rather, what I failed to do. I just didn’t bother to get personally involved in the affairs of government at any level.

I filled my days to earn large sums of dollars and spent too many nights celebrating when I did. Like millions of others, I stood by as inept elected officials bought votes with your money and changed America from a capitalistic, free enterprise country to a land ever-approaching mandated socialism.

The conventional investments I planned for your future failed the break-even point years ago. Savings, common stocks, and money funds were tied to the shrinking dollar and eroded away with inflation and taxes, just as they will when this economy turns around to monetize the most massive debt in history.

Over the past 15 years, most of my income was taken away in taxes to finance the enormous bureaucracy that now has a strangle hold on every aspect of our economy.

Even as I write this. I see the vultures circling -waiting to pick apart the probated portion of this will that was already riddled with taxes as I tried to keep it alive.
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My final prayer is that you will use my shortcomings as a warning light to guide your way. And that you will try to find forgiveness in your hearts for the things I failed to do.

Get involved. Help get America back into the hands of the earners and the producers.

From my generation you have learned that you cannot feed and house the whole world. You also learned that the country’s banks do not deserve blind faith. 60 of them failed this past year and 750 more are in trouble with assets represented by over-extended credit.

Don’t be afraid of what lies out there ahead, and don’t ever feel guilty about what you earned yourself. Don’t let elected officials give it away to the plunderers for the sake of re-election and self-enrichment.

When the day comes for you to retire, the Social Security program will be bankrupt and gone. I paid into it for nearly forty years but never withdrew a dime.

There is an automatic $275 burial fee you could withdraw for my funeral expenses. I have already designated funds to cover this so please turn it down and afford me the last dignity of paying my own way out.

In everlasting love,

Your dad,

Jesse Cornish

Jesse F. Cornish

State of Minnesota
County of Hennepin

Signed, sealed and delivered by Jesse F. Cornish this 17th day of November, 1980

2.11.8 America?

Is the America described below the type of place you would be proud to call your home and your country? Is it still the “land of the free and home of the brave?” We don’t think so. Instead, our government steals our money, uses it to subsidize failure and socialism, and then asks for yet more money to correct the problems that such failed policies produce. Any civilization that subsidizes and encourages failure and irresponsibility and decadence on the scale and of the kind described below is doomed to certain self destruction. The question is not if our society will collapse, but how long, unless we mend our ways, repent for our sins, and engage ourselves politically to force change and capitalism once again.

I come for visit, get treated regal,
So I stay, who care I illegal?
I cross border, poor and broke,
Take bus, see employment folk.

Nice man treat me good in there,
Say I need to see welfare,
Welfare say, "You come no more,
We send cash right to your door."

Welfare checks, they make you wealthy,
Medicaid it keep you healthy!
By and by, I got plenty money,
Thanks to you, American dummy.

Write to friends in motherland,
Tell them come as fast as you can.
They come in rags and Chebby trucks,
I buy big house with welfare bucks.
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They come here, we live together,
More welfare checks, it gets better!
Fourteen families they moving in,
But neighbor’s patience wearing thin.

Finally, white guy moves away,
Now I buy his house, and then I say,
"Find more aliens for house to rent."
And in the yard I put a tent.

Send for family (they just trash),
But they, too, draw the welfare cash!
Everything is mucho good,
And soon we own the neighborhood.

We have hobby--it's called breeding,
Welfare pay for baby feeding,
Kids need dentist? Wife need pills?
We get free! We got no bills!

American crazy! He pay all year,
To keep welfare running here.
We think America darn good place!
Too darn good for the white man race.

If they no like us, they can go,
Got lots of room in Mexico.

SEND THIS TO EVERY AMERICAN TAXPAYER YOU KNOW.

2.11.9 Grateful Slave

We downloaded the poem below off the internet. Replace “Master” with “IRS” and “Federal Reserve” and you will know what the point of this book is all about. Our public servants have sold out our country chasing after the almighty dollar. We have become slaves of debt and slaves of the IRS and the Federal Reserve in the process.

GRATEFUL SLAVE

I am a grateful slave.
My master is a good man.
He gives me food, shelter, work and other things.
All he requires in return is that I obey him.
I am told he has the power to control my life.
I look up to him, and wish that I were so powerful.

My master must understand the world better than I,
because he was chosen by many others for his respected position.
I sometimes complain, but fear I cannot live without his help.
He is a good man.

My master protects my money from theft, before and after he takes half of it.
Before taking his half, he says only he can protect my money.
After taking it, he says it is still mine.
When he spends my money, he says I own the things he has bought.
I don't understand this, but I believe him.
He is a good man.

I need my master for protection, because others would hurt me.
Or, they would take my money and use it for themselves.
My master is better than them:
When my master takes my money, I still own it.
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The things he buys are mine.
I cannot sell them, or decide how they are used, but they are mine.
My master tells me so, and I believe him.
He is a good man.

My master provides free education for my children.
He teaches them to respect and obey him and all future masters they will have.
He says they are being taught well; learning things they will need to know in the future.
I believe him.
He is a good man.

My master cares about other masters, who don't have good slaves.
He makes me contribute to their support.
I don't understand why slaves must work for more than one master, but my master says it is necessary.
I believe him.
He is a good man.

Other slaves ask my master for some of my money.
Since he is good to them as he is to me, he agrees.
This means he must take more of my money; but he says this is good for me.
I ask my master why it would not be better to let each of us keep our own money.
He says it is because he knows what is best for each of us.
We believe him.
He is a good man.

My master tells me:
Evil masters in other places are not as good as he; they threaten our comfortable lifestyle and peace.
So, he sends my children to fight the slaves of evil masters.
I mourn their deaths, but my master says it is necessary.
He gives me medals for their sacrifice, and I believe him.
He is a good man.

Good masters sometimes have to kill evil masters, and their slaves.
This is necessary to preserve our way of life; to show others that our version of slavery is the best.
I asked my master:
Why do evil masters' slaves have to be killed, along with their evil master?
He said: "Because they carry out his evil deeds."
"Besides, they could never learn our system; they have been indoctrinated to believe that only their master is good."
My master knows what is best.
He protects me and my children.
He is a good man.

My master lets me vote for a new master, every few years.
I cannot vote to have no master, but he generously lets me choose between two candidates he has selected.
I eagerly wait until election day, since voting allows me to forget that I am a slave.
Until then, my current master tells me what to do.
I accept this.
It has always been so, and I would not change tradition.
My master is a good man.

At the last election, about half the slaves were allowed to vote.
The other half had broken rules set by the master, or were not thought by him to be fit.
Those who break the rules should know better than to disobey!
Those not considered fit should gratefully accept the master chosen for them by others.
It is right, because we have always done it this way.
My master is a good man.
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There were two candidates.
One received a majority of the vote - about one-fourth of the slave population.
I asked why the new master can rule over all the slaves, if he only received votes from one-fourth of them?
My master said: "Because some wise masters long ago did it that way."
"Besides, you are the slaves; and we are the master."
I did not understand his answer, but I believed him.
My master knows what is best for me.
He is a good man.

Some slaves have evil masters.
They take more than half of their slaves' money and are chosen by only one-tenth, rather than one-fourth, of their slaves.
My master says they are different from him.
I believe him.
He is a good man.

I asked if I could ever become a master, instead of a slave.
My master said, "Yes, anything is possible."
"But first you must pledge allegiance to your present master, and promise not to abandon the system that made you a slave."
I am encouraged by this possibility.
My master is a good man.

He tells me slaves are the real masters, because they can vote for their masters.
I do not understand this, but I believe him.
He is a good man; who lives for no other purpose than to make his slaves happy.

I asked if I could be neither a master nor a slave.
My master said, "No, you must be one or the other."
"There are no other choices."
I believe him.
He knows best.
He is a good man.

I asked my master how our system is different, from those evil masters.
He said: "In our system, masters work for the slaves."
No longer confused, I am beginning to accept his logic.
Now I see it!
Slaves are in control of their masters, because they can choose new masters every few years.
When the masters appear to control the slaves in between elections, it is all a grand delusion!
In reality, they are carrying out the slaves' desires.
For if this were not so, they would not have been chosen in the last election.
How clear it is to me now!
I shall never doubt the system again.
My master is a good man.

2.11.10 Economics 101

Suppose that every day 10 men go to a restaurant for dinner. The bill for all ten comes to $100. If it was paid the way we pay our taxes, the first four men would pay nothing; the fifth would pay $1; the sixth would pay $3; the seventh $7; the eighth $12; the ninth $18. The tenth man, the richest, would pay $59.
The 10 men ate dinner in the restaurant every day and seemed quite happy with the arrangement until the owner threw them a curve. "Since you are all such good customers", he said, "I'm going to reduce the cost of your daily meal by $20." Now, dinner for the 10 only costs $80.
The first four are unaffected. They still eat for free. Can you figure out how to divvy up the $20 savings among the remaining six so that everyone gets his fair share? The men realize that $20 divided by 6 is $3.33, but if they subtract that from
everybody’s share, then the fifth man and the sixth man would end up being paid to eat their meal. The restaurant owner suggested that it would be fair to reduce each man’s bill by roughly the same amount, and he proceeded to work out the amounts each should pay. Now, the fifth man paid nothing, the sixth pitched in $2, the seventh paid $5, the eighth paid $9, the ninth paid $12, leaving the tenth man, the richest, with a bill of $52 instead of $59.

Outside the restaurant, the men began to compare their savings. "I only got a dollar out of the $20," complained the sixth man, pointing to the tenth, "and he got $7!" "Yeah, that's right," exclaimed the fifth man.

"I only saved a dollar, too. It's unfair that he got seven times more than me!"

"That's true," shouted the seventh man.

"Why should he get $7 back when I got only $2? The wealthy get all the breaks!"

"Wait a minute," yelled the first four men in unison. "We didn't get anything at all. The system exploits the poor." The nine men surrounded the tenth and beat him up. The next night he didn't show up for dinner, so the nine sat down and ate without him. But when it came time to pay the bill, they discovered something important. They were $52 short!

And that, boys, girls, college instructors and assorted totalitarian democrats, is how America's tax system works. The people who pay the highest taxes get the most benefit from a tax reduction. Tax them too much, attack them for being wealthy, and they just may not show up at the table any more. There are lots of good restaurants in Switzerland and the Caribbean.